

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

Vol. LIV. No. 127. December 1960.

December 1960

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. ATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society
G. W. Williams, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

*Representing the
Council of the
Classical Association*

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series

Volume X, No. 3

December 1960

CONTENTS

The Olympic Festival of 324 B.C.	B. R. SEALEY 185
<i>Aquila Senectus</i>	G. B. TOWNEND 186
A Gerundive in Juvenal	J. G. GRIFFITH 189
An unnoticed fragment of Sappho?	R. BROWNING 192
Parmenides, fr. 6	M. C. STOKES 193
The transformation of Io, <i>Ox. Pap.</i> xxiii, 2369	A. M. DALE 194
Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> xv. 44. 3-8	K. F. C. ROSE 195

REVIEWS:

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos (Snell, Fleischer, Mette), J. A. DAVISON, 195; *Daily Life in the Time of Homer* (Mireaux), D. H. F. GRAY, 197; *Bühnenbearbeitung Äschyleischer Tragödien* (Böhme), D. W. LUCAS, 198; *Sofocle* (Maddalena), D. W. LUCAS, 200; *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, ii (Edmonds), D. MERVYN JONES, 202; *Menander, Dyscolos* (Bingen), Menandro : *Dyskolos* (Diano), *Note in margine al Dyskolos* (Diano), *Menandros, Dyskolos* (Mette), *Notes on the Dyskolos* (Quincey, Ritchie, Shipp, Treweeck), *The Birth of Modern Comedy* (Webster), F. H. SANDBACH, 204; *An Introduction to the Greek Theatre* (Arnott), D. W. LUCAS, 207; *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (Bartoletti), H. D. WESTLAKE, 209; *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, x (Wehrli), G. B. KERFERD, 211; *Damascius, Lectures on the Philebus* (Westerink), A. WASSERSTEIN, 212; *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. vii (DeLacy and Einarsen), F. H. SANDBACH, 214; *A Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton*, ii (Rees, Bell, Barns), E. G. TURNER, 215; *Pauli Alexandrini Elēagayouká* (Boer), I. BULMER-THOMAS, 217; *Aelian, On Animals*, vol. ii (Scholfield), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 219; *Porphyrios' Σύμμακτα Ζητήματα* (Dörrie), A. H. ARMSTRONG, 220; *Plotini Opera*, ii (Henry, Schwyzler), A. H. ARMSTRONG, 221; *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano*, 195;

[continued on p. 3 of cover]





HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

1961 Hellenic Cruises

Under the patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of
Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Reading Universities

Cruise No. 22. 31 March to 16 April 1961

YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, DELPHI, MISTRA, SPARTA, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, SANTORINI, DELOS, VOLOS, THE METEORA, CAPE HELLES, GALLIPOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, PERGAMUM, EPHESUS or PRIENE, PATMOS, KNOSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

Cruise No. 23. 15 April to 1 May 1961

YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON, CYPRUS

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, PYLOS, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, KRAK DES CHEVALIERS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursions to either DAMASCUS and PALMYRA; or BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; or PETRA), FAMAGUSTA, SALAMIS, NICOSIA, ST. HILARIOON, BELLAPAIS, KYRENIA, RHODES, KAMIROS, DELOS, MYKONOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

Cruise No. 24. 30 April to 16 May 1961

YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, OLYMPIA, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, SIDE, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHESUS or PRIENE, PATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIPOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, DELOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, NAUPLION, MYCENAE, EPIDAURUS, TIRYNS, DELPHI, VENICE.

Cruise No. 25. 8 August to 24 August 1961

YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, KORCULA, OLYMPIA, OLD CORINTH, MYCENAE, TIRYNS, EPIDAURUS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHESUS, PATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIPOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, SAMOTHRAKI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, MYKONOS, DELPHI, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Cruise No. 26. 23 August to 8 September 1961

GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON

VENICE, DELPHI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, PAROS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursion to BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; Optional 2-day Air Excursion to DAMASCUS), MALLIA, KNOSSOS, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Cruise No. 27. 7 September to 23 September 1961

GREECE, EGYPT, YUGOSLAVIA

VENICE, DELPHI, DELOS, MYKONOS, RHODES, ALEXANDRIA, CAIRO, GIZA, MEMPHIS, SAKKARAH (Optional 2-day Excursion to LUXOR, Karnak, and THEBES), KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Each Cruise will be accompanied by four or five Guest Lecturers who will give Lectures on Board and at the various Sites visited.

Guest Lecturers accompanying Cruises include

Sir Maurice Bowra, Mr. R. W. Hamilton, Mr. N. G. L. Hammond, Mr. Michael MacLagan, Canon Guy Pentreath, Mr. Stewart Perowne, Professor W. B. Stanford, The Rev. Lawrence Ward, Mr. J. B. Ward Perkins, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Sir John Wolfenden, Mr. T. S. R. Boase, and Mr. J. C. Dancy.

PRICES FROM 95 GUINEAS

INCLUDING TRAVEL LONDON-VENICE AND RETURN

For full particulars and reservations apply to

W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.
260 (K59) Tottenham Court Road, London, W.1

Telephone: MUSEum 8070 (15 lines)



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. †W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.
†E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.
L. A. POST, L.H.D.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Folio 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 18s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1960-61

LATIN

416 AUGUSTINE *City of God*. Seven volumes, Vol. VI. Translated by W. C. Greene.

GREEK

391 ARISTOTLE *Organon—Posterior Analytics and Topics*. Translated by H. Tredeannick and E. S. Forster.

425 PLUTARCH *Moralia*. Fifteen volumes, Vol. IX. Translated by W. C. Helmbold, E. L. Minar, Jr., and F. H. Sandbach.

431 LUCIAN. Eight volumes, Vol. VII. Translated by M. D. Macleod.

379 PHILO. Ten volumes, Vol. X. Translated by F. H. Colson; Index by the Rev. J. W. Earp.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE GREEK LANGUAGE

By GEORGE THOMSON

Professor of Greek in the University of Birmingham

15s. net

Based on courses given at Birmingham University, designed for beginners, this book starts with historical and comparative linguistics, then presents the history of Greek from the ancient language to Modern Greek. It is hoped that the book will serve both as a textbook for classes and as an introduction for individual students.

HEFFER · CAMBRIDGE

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME X NO. 3
(VOLUME LXXIV OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1960

THE OLYMPIC FESTIVAL OF 324 B.C.

ABOUT 468 the Olympic festival was extended to last five days.¹ According to the scholiast on Pindar, *Ol.* 3. 35 the festival culminated on its last day on the sixteenth of the Elean month. The same scholiast says that the festival fell alternately in the Elean months of Parthenius and Apollonius, which he equates with the Egyptian months of Thoth and Mesori respectively; and the scholiast points out that the interval between Olympiads embraced alternately forty-nine and fifty Elean months.

In 480 the rain-storm following the first day of fighting at Artemisium fell in the middle of summer.² Herodotus says so. Here happily two questions need not be asked—whether the rain-storm was the same as the storm which damaged ships off the Magnesian coast, and whether Herodotus was right in synchronizing precisely the battles of Thermopylae and Artemisium. For whatever the answers to these questions, Herodotus indicates that the battles were fought in the middle of summer. The Carneian and Olympic festivals provided some states with an excuse not to send many troops to Thermopylae.³ It follows that in Herodotus' opinion the Olympic festival of 480 fell towards the middle of summer. Nor need questions be asked about Herodotus' accuracy or fallibility; his evidence is as good as any there is on the date of the Olympic festival.

The festival culminated at the full moon. It used to be widely believed that the festival fell about July of the Julian calendar; and Herodotus' statement could be cited in support of this view. But this view was doubted by F. K. Ginzel.⁴ He relied on two passages. First, in the scholion summarized above he drew attention to the equation of Parthenius and Apollonius with Thoth and Mesori. Thoth follows Mesori and in the Alexandrian calendar the two months span the period 25 July–27 September. Secondly, Ginzel tried to use the scholium on Pindar, *Ol.* 3. 33. This scholium is seriously corrupt, but as restored and interpreted by Weniger it seemed to say that the Elean year began at the new moon nearest to the winter-solstice; that the first Olympic festival was held in the eighth month; and that the festival fell alternately in the ὄνταρα and at the heliacal rising of Arcturus. The concept of ὄνταρα was imprecise. But in 776 B.C. the winter-solstice fell at 28 December; so the eighth month would be about August. And in 700 B.C. the heliacal rising of Arcturus fell at 17 September. So Ginzel could cite with approval the view of Nissen, that in odd Olympiads the festival culminated at the full moon of August and in even Olympiads it culminated at the full moon of September.

¹ Paus. v. 9. 3.

² Hdt. viii. 12. 1.

³ Hdt. vii. 206; cf. viii. 26; 72. (Aelian, *V.H.* xiv. 18 merely shows that the festival

was celebrated in hot weather.)

⁴ *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, ii. 353–6.

K. J. Beloch¹ approached the problem in a different way. He thought that literary evidence enabled him to determine the actual dates of the full moon at the Olympic festival in four specific years. Thus he offered these dates:

- 480 B.C.: Ol. 75: 21 July or 19 August
- 428 B.C.: Ol. 88: 14 August
- 208 B.C.: Ol. 143: 13 July
- 44 B.C.: Ol. 184: 29 August.

Beloch's conclusion was that in even Olympiads the festival fell in August but in odd Olympiads in July. No complete certainty can be claimed for Beloch's dates; in particular he could not prove that the Olympic festival ever fell as early as July, although Herodotus' reference to 'the middle of summer' supports that belief. Following Ginzel's doctrine most students of the year 324 (Ol. 114) have thought that then the Olympic festival culminated at the full moon of 3 September.

It must still be admitted that Herodotus' statement tells against Ginzel's view. The positive grounds for his view are not strong. In the corrupt scholium the figure may not be sound; figures, like words, suffer corruption more easily in scholia than in texts proper. The wording of the scholium in its present form is so brief that any interpretation is rather speculative. Apart from the textual question, it is not possible to estimate the accuracy of the calculations on which either scholium was based. An equation of Elean months with Egyptian months could only be approximate, especially as one calendar was solar and the other solilunar.

These criticisms might be inconclusive, but a recent discovery has added a new fact towards solving the problem. Monsieur J. Labarbe² has shown that the battle of Thermopylae was fought at the time of the heliacal rising of Sirius, that is, about 30 July 480. It follows that the Olympic festival of 480, which discouraged some states from sending troops to Thermopylae, culminated at the full moon of 21 July. Thus at least one Olympic festival fell in July, and this accords well with Herodotus' remark about 'the middle of summer'. If this is combined with Beloch's other dates, it will be noticed that no Olympic festival is known to have fallen as late as September, and so Beloch's conclusion can be reaffirmed. Pending further discoveries it should be supposed that the Olympic festival of 324 culminated at the full moon of 4 August. So the story of Harpalus' arrival in Athens needs to be rewritten.

Queen Mary College (University of London)

RAPHAEL SEALEY

AQUILAE SENECTUS

IN Terence, *Heaut.* 518 ff., the slave Syrus greets the old man Chremes, and expresses surprise to find him abroad '*tam mane, qui heri tantum biberis*'. '*Nil nimis*', replies Chremes. Syrus retorts, '*Nil, narras? visa verost, quod dici solet, aquilae senectus.*'

¹ *Griechische Geschichte*, i². 2. 139–40. Dates of full moons are given by Ginzel, ii. 557–75. Beloch's theory is accepted by L. Ziehen, *R.E.* xviii. 3.

² *Bull. Corr. Hell.* lxxvii (1954), 1–21. The argument rests on Polyacn. i. 32. 2. Labarbe accepts Beloch's theory about the date of the festival without discussing it.

Two conflicting interpretations of this last phrase have apparently been current since antiquity. The more popular makes Syrus suggest that Chremes had exhibited all the vigour of youth. This was evidently understood by Ausonius in his quotation of the phrase (*Prof.* 4. 2): *laetus, pudicus, pulcher in senio quoque, aquilae senectus*. It is supported by the Greek proverb given in full by Gregory of Cyprus, in *Corp. Paroem. Graec.* ii, p. 53: ἀετοῦ γῆρας, κορύδον νέότης παρ' ὅσον καὶ γηράσκων ἀετὸς κρέσσων ή νεάνιον ὄρυθος, and repeated by Zenobius, *ibid.* i, p. 42. This view, accepted in particular by Wagner and Ashmore, is implied in the translations of Mme Dacier (1733), Cook (1749), Coqueline (1767), and Sargeant (Loeb, 1912), the last with 'The eagle, they say, has eternal youth'. A variant on this interpretation is recognized by Westerhovius in 1726: *Scilicet aquilae quasi renovare vires senectute dicuntur*. This is based on Psalm ciii. 5, and perhaps on Isaiah xl. 31, and was noted by Jerome and others; but there is no reason to suppose that it belongs to Greek or Roman thought. Ritchie follows it in his translation (1927): 'You seemed to renew your youth like the eagle.'

An entirely different view, that old men drink the more as they eat less, was put forward by Euphrasius: *aunt aquilam in senectute, quod ei rostri pars exterior vetustate et incremento curvata foramen includat, ad cadavera accedere et sic sanguinem in potum sumere et quodammodo bibendo vivere*. He derives this either from Pliny, *N.H.* x. 15, or directly from the Aristotelian *Hist. Anim.* ix. 32. 619^a. This piece of lore is already cited by Zenobius, *i.c.*, as a gloss on the proverb ἀετοῦ γῆρας, to which it is not relevant; and it is used to explain Terence by Calphurnius, Hackius (1686), Nisard (1732), and, by implication, in the Delphin, and it is given with the other explanation by Dacier and Westerhovius. The former, indeed, has a note: 'Une vieillesse verte et vigoureuse, comme celle de l'aigle, qui ne meurt jamais de vieillesse, et qui sur la fin de sa vie ne peut se conserver qu'en buvant toujours.' This is an evident confusion. Syrus cannot be implying simultaneously that Chremes has the vigour and capacity of a young man, and that he depends on drink because he is too old to eat. Yet the inconsistency persists in such commentaries as that of Gray (1895), who translates: 'You showed yourself as fresh as an old eagle and drank as much'; while Marouzeau, in the Budé (1949), gives on the one hand Ausonius and the full Greek proverb, on the other Pliny and Euphrasius. In this dilemma, no attempt seems to have been made to determine what must have appeared in Menander's Greek original, or what Terence's phrase must have meant to his audience.

The former question is quickly answered. Terence's words *ut dici solet* imply a proverb; and the proverb is clearly the Greek one given by Gregory, with his explanation. Menander presumably gave only the first, immediately relevant half of it, exactly as he twice quotes the incomplete ὅσος λύπας (*Misum.* 41 and *fr. 460*), leaving his audience to understand the rest, and supported it either with φασί (as *Epit.* 223) or with τὸ λεγόμενον (as *fr. 332. 8, 689*), or with both (*fr. 447*). There is no reason to suppose that Aristotle's piece of natural history ever became proverbial, or ever attached itself to the phrase ἀετοῦ γῆρας so long as that was current. Despite the attractive connexion of old age and drink, it plainly has no bearing on this passage.

But, given that Menander's slave undoubtedly intended to flatter the old man by comparing him favourably with younger men, it is not clear that Terence understood the phrase in the same sense. Certainly translators have found great difficulty in extracting anything like the required meaning: as

Cook's 'You are a miracle of nature', Sargeaunt's 'The eagle, they say, has eternal youth' (both of which ignore *visa est*), Nisard's 'Vous m'avez paru comme fait, dit-on, l'aigle dans sa jeunesse', and the cumbersome though conscientious version of Marouzeau, 'Voire! ce qui s'est vu là, c'est, comme on dit, la vieillesse de l'aigle.' None of these rings true, and it is hardly surprising that so many scholars have preferred Euphrasius' interpretation. The trouble is that Syrus' whole remark seems to go much more closely together, as 'Nothing, you say? It looked (to me) like the old age of an eagle.' In other words, *visa est* is surely to be taken as 'seemed', with *aquila senectus* as complement, and some such subject implied as 'what you drank', so as to make a strong contrast between *nil* and *aquila senectus*, as if the latter could represent 'a great amount of drink'.

Now there is in Latin literature an exact parallel to this sort of expression. Ovid, in *Fasti* iii. 531-4, describes the drinking-bouts at the festival of Anna Perenna:

annosque precantur
quot sumant cyathos, ad numerumque bibunt.
invenies illic qui Nestoris ebibat annos,
quae sit per calices facta Sibylla suos.

This is sound evidence that some Romans, on some occasions, were in the habit of connecting heavy drinking with equalling the years of some long-lived creature. Since Ovid takes pains to explain the custom, it may have been obsolescent in the Augustan age; and thus, as part of an ancient festival, it may well have been better known to earlier generations. There certainly appears to be no reference elsewhere to anything closer to this than the similar custom of drinking to match the number of letters in a beloved's name (cf. Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. *comissatio*); but similarly the whole festival is unrecorded elsewhere.

Now Terence, expert as he was in reproducing Menandrian dialogue in Latin, was frequently unable to render proverbial phrases into language which his audience could understand, whether or not he understood the Greek reference himself. He made a notorious error over Menander's *γαλεώτης* at *Eun.* 688-9, and perhaps over the original of *lepus tute es, pulpamentum quaeris* at *Eun.* 426 (cf. Otto, *Sprichw.*, p. 191, *lepus* 3); while he seems to have made nothing at all of *παττάλον γυμνοτέραν* (fr. 9) at *And.* 693; of *ψῶν . . . νεόττιον* (fr. 37) at *And.* 483; of either *ἐν ταῖς τροσίν* or *ἀστικτον* (fr. 127) at *Heaut.* 64; or of *λύκου πτερά* (fr. 167), which has left no trace in *Eunuchus*. Some proverbs were clear enough in themselves to stand direct translation, as at *Ad.* 803-4, where he carefully introduces the common Greek *κοντὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων* (fr. 10) with *nam vetus verbum hoc quidemst, communia esse amicorum inter se omnia* (it was clearly not proverbial in Latin); or at *And.* 805: *ut quimus, aiunt, quando ut volumus non licet*, which is a straight translation of fr. 45. But *ἀστροῦ γῆρας*, which would be meaningless to anyone who did not know the completion of the proverb, he not unreasonably associated with the practice of heavy drinking known to him and to most of his Roman audience; and this is the sense which most easily emerges from his otherwise perplexing phrasing. Had he correctly understood Menander, and attempted to reproduce the meaning of the original, he would not have left such a problem for modern translators.

A GERUNDIVE IN JUVENAL

JUVENAL 12. 10-15:

si res ampla domi similisque affectibus esset,
pinguior Hispulla traheretur taurus et ipsa
mole piger, nec finitima nutritus in herba
laeta sed ostendens Clitumni pascua sanguis
iret et a grandi cervix ferienda ministro
ob redditum . . . amici.

10

15

13 sanguis . . . ministro *apud Servium* (*Aen.* viii. 106) 14 iret et a grandi] iret et
grandi *PA*: iret et magno *Serv. cod. Floriac.*: iret et a magno (*magna A Servii*) *codd. rell. Iuv.*
et Serv.: et grandi cervix iret *Housman*

So ran the accepted text until 1905, when Housman altered the syntax by his transposition in line 14. Weidner and some others had confessed to critical qualms about 13-14, but time has dealt with such suggestions as they offered. As, however, Knoche in his text of 1950 obelizes *sanguis* (which can ill be spared from this context) and Clausen in his new Oxford Classical Text perpetuates Housman's wayward transposition, the passage needs to be considered afresh.

The drift of the sentence is not in doubt but, apart from the absence of a Juvenalian parallel for the use of the preposition *a* (*ab*) with the gerundive (on which something will be said later), Housman's primary reason for his transposition was to remove the verb *iret* from the immediate neighbourhood of the noun *sanguis*. He thought it essential that *iret* here should be plainly indicated as a verb of motion (*πρὸς βασιόν πατεῖν*), whereas if *sanguis* preceded it, the resulting word-group could, in his view, only be taken to mean *cuor flueret*, as indeed it does in contexts such as Lucretius vi. 1203. The accepted text contained, in fact, a vicious zeugma, in so far as *iret* would seem to carry one meaning in relation to *sanguis* and another to *cervix* in the following clause. Transposition is not, however, the only way of rectifying matters, and certainly not the most economical: one needs only to punctuate after *sanguis* with a colon (or semicolon). Thus the *nec*-clause of 12 and the *sed*-clause of 13 are coupled in antithesis and together are apposed to line 11, and a fresh start is made in 14. It is no objection that *et* in 14 will thus stand second in its clause while performing a connective function; although this mannerism is not as common in Juvenal as it is in earlier poets, instances occur, as, for example, 9. 108 or 13. 82.

Even repunctuation may not be necessary, if it is held that in a clear-cut context such as this the noun *sanguis* might, without further specification, carry the force of *victima*, as it does in Statius, *Theb.* xi. 284 (quoted by Duff on this passage):

hostia, nate, iaces ceu mutus et e grege sanguis.

To this it may be objected that the use of *sanguis* by synecdoche for *victima* in one line followed by the not dissimilar noun *cervix* in the next with its literal meaning is a stylistic blemish. The safer course would therefore be to repunctuate, as suggested.

What is to be said of the idiom *a ministro ferienda* here? Housman rejected it for Juvenal and, regarding the reading of *PA* as an intermediate stage in the textual degeneration, explained the preposition found in the bulk of the manuscripts as a metre-saving insertion, necessary when once *iret* had been moved forward in the line from the later place he had imagined for it. He appealed

also to the P-scholiast, who glosses *ministro* by *sacerdoti*; Wessner, however (*Scholia in Iuvenalem*, p. 194), printed Barth's emendation *sacerdote* and in his appendix (p. 280) explained the dative in the scholium as an accommodation to the dative which seemed to stand in the text once the preposition had dropped out in P or its exemplar. Suspending judgement for the moment on this passage, one turns to other instances of the idiom in Latin. Only Roby (ii, p. lxxv) among modern syntacticians sets out the material in sufficient completeness to make stylistic examination possible, although his explanations (§ 147) do not touch the root of the matter. He lists 41 occurrences,¹ no fewer than 35 of these being from Cicero, chiefly from the speeches and letters. Kühner-Stegmann (i. 730) add two more,² but cite only a selection of Roby's instances, with no attempt at systematic classification. The known cases fall into three main groups, with a small unclassified residue; some might well be assigned to more than one group, but the issue is not affected thereby. It will be seen that this idiom, besides its familiar use for avoiding ambiguity with verbs which govern a remoter object in the dative, is favoured with a well-marked group of verbs and their equivalent phrases, but is otherwise reserved for the formality of a legal or sacral context. It is noteworthy that rather more than two-thirds of the examples show the agent in the form of a personal pronoun, *a me* and *a te* predominating.

Group A (1). *a (ab)* used with gerundive to avoid ambiguity when the gerundive verb is associated with a remoter object in the dative. These verbs are:

dicendum; Cic. *Verr.* iii. 60 (*a me dicendum putatis*), cf. *Scaur.* 44, *De Or.* iii.

147.

scribendum; *Att.* xi. 3. 3 : *Fam.* xv. 9. 3.

opponendum; *Part. Or.* 103 (with *ab accusatore*, cf. Group B).

consulendum; *Imp. Pomp.* 6.

gratias agendas; *red. in Sen.* 31 : cf. *Planc.* 78.

dandos; *Fam.* xi. 20.3 (letter of Brutus to Cicero).

Or. iii. 37 should probably be included here: *agenda ab oratore . . . et dicenda*, where the following *dicenda* may have influenced the construction with *agenda* preceding. Add too *Sen. Epp.* 65. 3 *quae ab homine facienda sunt*, where the dative *homini*, if written, need not have been the dative of the agent.

Group A (2). Somewhat akin to the above are those cases where another noun in the ablative, governed by a perfect passive participle or a preposition, immediately precedes or follows the gerundival agent. Typical is *Fam.* i. 9. 17 *ab iis a quibus tuendus fuerat derelictus*: cf. *Rab. Perd.* 4 and *Mur.* 54 (locus) *perpurgatus ab omnibus, a me . . . retractandus*. Here there is ungainliness to avoid rather than ambiguity, but the dative of the agent would have been misleading if employed in the phrase in *Fam.* xii. 22a. 3: *de provinciis ab iis qui obtinerent retinendis* (cf. *Fam.* iii. 11. 3).

¹ In fact 42, but Cic. *De Or.* ii. 86 has no place here; as Wilkins saw, *a cohortatione nostra* means 'in respect of' and carries no agentival force.

² Cic. *Fin.* ii. 30 and *Vell. Pat.* ii. 48.1 (both Group C below). Cic. *Fam.* xii. 23. 1 might be added, if the restoration . . . *fers,* *a te ea . . .* could be regarded as certain.

One may feel fairly sure that this total

(43) of textually reliable instances is near the mark. The only list known to me before Roby which has pretensions to completeness is that given by Fr. Schneider (*Jahrb. f. kl. Phil.*, 1845, p. 441), which records 29 out of Roby's 35 Ciceronian references and contains none that Roby may have missed. The small number which have come to light since is significant.

Group B. Verbs which have an affinity to this construction:

accusare; *Har. Resp.* 5. With this *Sest.* 41 *causam a consulibus suscipiendam* might be taken, but it could equally well be put in Group C (below). With this concept it may have been that a wish to emphasize the initiative required of any launcher of a prosecution sanctioned the ablative construction; so Riemann (*Synt. Latine*, p. 94, n. 5).

defendere; to *Fam.* iii. 8. 6. should be added *Rhet. Her.* i. 3 (5) *ab omnibus defendendum*.

monere (admonere); to the 4 Ciceronian examples of the type *te a me... monendum puto* (*Sull.* 23: *Fam.* xv. 4. 11: *Font.* 42: *Att.* xiii. 30. 2, if the text is sound) is to be added *Livy* xlv. 22. 12.

Group C. These passages have marked legal or sacral associations. The bulk of them show an official functionary as the agent, or contain a vocative such as *iudices* within the phrase, as, for example, *a vobis, iudices, condemnandum virum* (*Mil.* 104, from the peroration). With *a iudicibus condemnandus est* of *Planc.* 8 (cf. *Caec.* 33: *Fin.* ii. 30) may be taken *a senatu notandus* of *Phil.* iii. 21, and perhaps *Balb.* 7. *Fam.* iii. 11. 3 could be placed here, instead of in Group A (2) above, as could *Sest.* 41 and *Font.* 42 (both in Group B). A certain addition to the Ciceronian examples of this class is *Livy* ix. 40. 16 *initium fori ornandi ab aedibus*, and a possible one *Vell. Pat.* ii. 48. 1 (*a Caesare dimittendos exercitus*, but Velleius is no rigorous stylist).

The religious instances which may be taken with these, in that sacral and legal phraseology had much in common in early Latin, are not so numerous, but include *Agr.* ii. 95 *maiores nostros... venerandos a nobis et colendos putatis*; cf. *Fam.* xiii. 16. 2 *a se observandos et colendos putabat*. *Phil.* xiv. 11 *supplicatio ab eo decernenda* may be placed here, although, as *ei* would have been ambiguous, it could be added to Group A (1) above. Two slightly puzzling instances have some claim to inclusion here: *Att.* vi. 6. 4 *litterae me ad triumphum vocant, rem a nobis propter hanc παλιγγενεῖαν nostram non negligendam*, and *Att.* x. 4. 6 *ab illo... negligenda*. As both these involve the same verb, *negligere*, it might have seemed proper to have put them in Group B as a fourth category, but when one remembers how punctilious the Romans were in religious detail and how seriously they regarded any 'neglect' in this matter, the grouping suggested may stand.

The unclassified residue may be briefly dealt with.

(i) Ovid, *Met.* viii. 710... *neu sim tumulandus ab illa*. This could be claimed for the religious examples of the last Group, were it not for a suspicion that the gerundival expression is no more than a versifier's periphrasis for *tumuler*, with which *ab illa* would be required.

(ii) Cic. *Phil.* xiii. 24 *nomen... ab eo... usurpandum, qui...* This appears aberrant, without obvious justification.

In each of these last two examples, the sense of the initiative required of the agent may have been felt, thus bringing these cases close to the verbs enumerated in Group B above, and possibly nothing further is needed by way of explanation.

(iii) Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 34 *a me in dicendo praetereunda non sunt*. Here the construction can hardly have been influenced by the gerund *dicendo*. Unless a very special emphasis is being laid on the pronominal agent, this too is unexplained.

The upshot, however, is clear. Although the instances recorded are relatively

few and distributed over too small an area of surviving Latin to warrant sweeping generalization, the fact that nearly one quarter of them are found in legal and religious contexts gives ample ground for allowing Juvenal his phrase *a ministro ferienda*. It is immaterial whether one justifies it on the score of the agent *ministro* conceived as an official, and, as such, parallel to those listed earlier, or on the more general ground of the obviously religious context. To force the dative construction upon Juvenal here may be to brush away from his writing a delicate bloom of formal language and to spoil something of the desired effect. Here it is the P-stream of his textual tradition that misleads, whether by carelessness or from a misplaced striving for normality of syntax on the part of an interpolating scholar in the Dark Ages. The truth lies elsewhere, among the *deteriores*, which here offer an unexceptionable lection, to which editors should gratefully return.¹

Jesus College, Oxford

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

AN UNNOTICED FRAGMENT OF SAPPHO?

THE Bodleian manuscript Barocci 131 is a rhetorical miscellany written early in the fourteenth century and consisting in the main of twelfth-century texts. A great many of these are unique; some of the unique texts have been edited from this manuscript, while others remain unpublished. Among the latter is an anonymous panegyric on the Patriarch Michael II Orites and the Emperor Manuel I (fols. 224-227^v), entitled: *Τοῦ ἀνανόμου λόγου εἰς τὸν πατριάρχην κύριον Μιχαὴλ τὸν πρώτην ἡγόνευν τῆς Ὁρέας*, beginning: *Γάμος ἐστὶ μὲν σωματικός ἀλλ᾽ ἡμεῖς γε τὸν πνευματικὸν ἔστραζομεν*, and ending: *τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ κυβερνῶμεν*. As the panegyric celebrates the consecration of Michael II and the very recent accession of Manuel I, it can be dated to July 1143 or shortly thereafter (cf. V. Grumel, *R.E.B.* i [1943] 253-5). It is an insignificant work, of no literary merit and furnishing virtually no information not known from other sources. We cannot even guess at its authorship.²

On fol. 224, where the panegyrist is developing the parallel between the spiritual marriage of a bishop to his church and a secular marriage, occurs the following passage: . . . ἐπιθαλάμιον ἄδομεν, οὐχ οἷον Ἀπόλλων ἤχησεν ἐγαμοίς τῆς Αἱράσθης, οὐχ οἷον αἱ Μούσαι ποτε ἀνέκρουσαντο. Πηλεῖ συνερχομένῳ τῇ Θετίδι (τῆς Θετίδος cod.), οὐδὲ οἷον ἄδει Σαπφώ ἡ ποιήτρια μαλακοῖς τοις ρύθμοις καὶ μέλεσι ἐκλειμένοις τὰς φύλας διαπλέκουσα (diaplectenon cod.), καὶ ἵππους

ἀδλοφόρους ἀπεικάνουσα τοὺς νυμφίους, ρόδων δ' ἀβρότητι παραβάλλουσα τὰς νυψενομένους παρθένους, καὶ τὸ φθέγμα πηκτίδος ἐμμελέτερον ποιοῦσα.

There is no trace of this simile among the recognized fragments of Sappho's epithalamia. It is not on that account to be rejected. The comparison of young men to an ἀδλοφόρος ἵππος is traditional (cf. *Il. xxii. 22*, 162), and that of a young girl to a rose is obvious. Ἀβρότητι is not attested in Sappho, but it may be a prose paraphrase of ἀρροτήτη, which Sappho does use (fr. 58. 25 Lobel-Page), while ἀβρός is one of her favourite words (six examples in Page's index). The phrase ρόδων ἀβροτέρα attributed to Sappho by Gregory of Corinth in his commentary on Hermogenes' *Περὶ μεθόδου δευτέρης* (Walz, *Rh. Gr.* vii. 1236. 14) may well be a reminiscence of the same passage. Such comparisons of bride and bridegroom to natural objects were in place in an epithalamium; cf. Sappho fr. 105, 115 Lobel-Page. The concluding phrase καὶ τὸ φθέγμα πηκτίδος ἐμμελέτερον ποιοῦσα is an echo of fr. 156 Lobel-Page. Gregory of Corinth, loc. cit., cites πηκτίδων ἐμμελεστέρα as Sapphic.

Our panegyrist will have got his citation not from an anthology, still less from a text of Sappho, but from a rhetorical handbook. Theyric poets were recommended by teachers of rhetoric in late antiquity for the models of praise and blame which they furnished; cf. Menander, *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* 4 (Spengel,

¹ I am very grateful to Professor Daube, who saw an early draft of this note and made valuable suggestions.

² Michael Italicus cannot be ruled out.

He probably owed his appointment as Metropolitan of Philippopolis to Michael II, and would therefore still be in Constantinople at this time.

Rh. G
ποιητή
λαρικός
μῆτρα
δημογέ^{τη}
The
mend
Περὶ
17) πο
συγγρ
ἐπιφα
τῶν
Unive

I grv
Kran

Пр
<
авт
с
πλα
στή
κων
·
ols
ко
ко
·
Th
the
re
less
d
ing
o
cruci
in L
it we
that i
is fair
perha

The
cour
as an
pressed
seem
unless

1
2
or el
[1921]
version
in R/
tain
There
ment
which

Rh. Gr. iii. 393. 5) ἔχειν δὲ δεῖ σε μνήμην καὶ ποιητῶν ἐπισήμων 'Ομήρου, 'Ησιόδου, τῶν λυρικῶν. αὐτοί τε γάρ καθ' ἑαυτὸς ἀξοῖς μνῆμης, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐνεκαυμάσαν, πολλοὺς δὲ θεύξαν,¹ παρ' ὧν δυνήσῃ λαβεῖν παραδείγματα. The same Menander particularly recommends Sappho as a model for epithalamia; cf. *Περὶ ἐπιθαλαμικῶν* 6 (Spengel, Rh. Gr. iii. 402. 17) πολλὴ δὲ ἴστορία τοιαύτη παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῖσι, παρ' ὧν καὶ λίθῳ τὴν χορηγίαν, ἐπιφωνήσεις δὲ καὶ τῶν Σαπτοῦς ἐρωτικῶν καὶ τῶν 'Ομήρου καὶ 'Ησιόδου. Syrianius, the

fifth-century Neoplatonist, in his commentary on the *Περὶ ἴδεων* of Hermogenes (ed. Rabe i. p. 15) cites two passages of Sappho verbatim. Gregory of Corinth, in his rich commentary on Hermogenes' *Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος*,² cites several passages in prose paraphrase, one of which Hermann and other nineteenth-century scholars attempted to restore (fr. 201 Page-Lobel; for suggested restorations cf. Bergk, *P.L.G.*⁴ iii. 133). These instances of the use of Sappho by rhetoricians could easily be multiplied.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

PARMENIDES, FRAGMENT 6³

I give the text and punctuation of Diels-Kranz for lines 3 ff.:

Πρώτης γάρ σ' ἄφ' ὁδοῦ ταύτης διζήσιος
<εἰργα>,
αὐτῷρ ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῆς, ἦν δὲ βροτοὶ εἰδότες
οὐδὲν
πλάττονται, δίκρανοι· ἀμηχανή γάρ ἐν αὐτῶν
στήθεσσιν θύνει πλακτὸν νόσον οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται
κυφοὶ δύμας τυφλοὶ τε, τεθῆπτες, ἄκριτα
φύλα,
οἱς τὸ πλευρὸν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταῦτὸν νενό-
μασται
κούν ταῦτόν, πάντων δὲ παλίντροπός ἔστι
κέλευθος.

There has been much controversy over the question whether or not this fragment refers to the philosophy of Heraclitus; much less discussion of the construction and meaning of these singularly difficult lines. The crucial point concerns the gender of *πάντων* in l. 9. Kirk-Raven, p. 271, translate as if it were neuter, while admitting, p. 272 n. 1, that it is possible that it is masculine. This is fair enough; but the word 'possible' is perhaps an understatement.

Those who take *πάντων* as neuter must of course take the phrase *πάντων . . . κέλευθος* as an addition to the beliefs of mortals expressed in the previous line and a half. This seems to have unpalatable consequences. For, unless Parmenides simply made a grammatical

error in putting *ἔστι* for *εἴναι*,⁴ the phrase *οἱς . . . έστι* must mean the same as *οἱς . . . νενόμασται*. Even if this were plausible in itself, it would have the awkwardness that the dative *οἱς* would have to be in the first place a dative of the agent, in the second place a quite different sort of dative; the zeugma, if not impossible, makes ugly Greek. But in any case it is not very plausible. The dative can be used 'after' *εἴναι* (the copula) as after other verbs to mean 'in the judgement of', 'in the eyes of'. (See Kühner-Gerth, i. 421 f., who translate 'nach dem Urteil, in den Augen jemandes'.) But here the word 'judgement' or 'Urteil' should be taken very strictly. The examples cited by Kühner-Gerth, loc. cit., do not include any where the point at issue, that is to say the opinion held by the person in the dative, is one on a question of fact. In all the instances of this dative there cited, and (I believe) in all that exist, the point at issue is one of value, of approval or the reverse. In fact this dative means emphatically 'nach dem Urteil jemandes', and not 'nach der Meinung'. Now in Parmenides fr. 6 the point at issue, if one takes *πάντων* as neuter, is one of fact; the goddess might use the word *παλίντροπος* as an epithet denoting an adverse judgement of value on the part of the speaker; but it is obvious at a glance that mortals would not so use it, or use it as an epithet to denote

¹ I would hazard the conjecture *ἔψεξαν*.

² If Maas's dating of Gregory in the tenth or eleventh century (*Byz.-neogr. Jahrb.* ii [1921], 53–55) is accepted, then the fuller version of the commentary, printed by Walz in Rh. Gr. vii, cannot be by him, as it contains several references to John Tzetzes. There is room for further work on the commentaries on the *Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος*, which are particularly rich in quotations.

Cf. H. Rabe, 'Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften', Rh. M. lxiii (1912), 127–51.

³ I must thank Professor Eduard Fraenkel for a most helpful discussion of this passage, and Professor A. J. Beattie for reading this article and suggesting some improvements. Neither has given it his *imprimatur*.

⁴ *εἴναι* of course would not scan; but if Parmenides had wanted it he could easily have recast the line.

approval. Hence, if Parmenides meant of *ērī* as the equivalent of *oīs . . . νερόμυσται*, he was extending the use of this dative. It seems particularly improbable that Parmenides, of all people, with his clear distinction between being and being believed by mortals to be, should have so extended linguistic usage as to make *oīs . . . ērī* the equivalent of *oīs . . . νερόμυσται*. It results that it is most unlikely that *πάντων* is neuter.

On the other hand, if we take *πάντων* as masculine, other difficulties arise. With the punctuation of Diels-Kranz we are compelled to take *πάντων* as 'picking up' *oīs*. The trouble with this is that when in Greek the relative pronoun is omitted in the second of two co-ordinate relative clauses the word, if any, which is used to pick it up appears always to be another pronoun. Words like

University of Edinburgh

MICHAEL C. STOKES

THE TRANSFORMATION OF IO, OX. PAP. XXIII. 2369

WHEN, when Io is changed into a heifer, should a γυνὴ λέανα be found sitting 'working flax' (*ἡγεται λινεργή[ός or -[όν] Lobel*) or 'worked in flax' (*λινεργή[ής* Pfeiffer, 'Ein neues Inachos-Fragment des Soph.', *Sitz. Ber. Bay. Ak.*, 1958, p. 24)? Commenting that a 'lion-woman' can hardly be anything other than a Sphinx (cf. Lloyd-Jones, *C.R.* lxii [1958], 20), Pfeiffer calls for an Oedipus to solve the riddle and so perhaps dismiss the whole monster.

I would not claim to be an Oedipus, but the Sphinx must surely go. The whole metamorphosis is being directly and forcefully described by Inachus in eight lines of indignant pity, leading up to *τοιαῦτα*, and comparison with other compound monsters or description of embroidered cloths or carpets would tail off with debilitating effect. The seated woman can only be Io, and therefore λινεργ- must refer to her activities—or just conceivably to those of her companions; she was sitting spinning² when misfortune overtook her. It follows that her transformation is not total, and she is not clambering over the furniture. Her cow-muzzle, head, neck, shoulders, and hooves are mentioned, and the hooves 'clatter on' θράνοι. The meaning and construction of this word are uncertain: if θράνοι in the sense of 'benches' or 'foot-stools', the plural is slightly unnatural, but

πάντων are apparently not used in this way.

I suggest that the most satisfactory way out of the problem is to punctuate with a colon after *κού ταῦτόν*, taking *πάντων δέ . . .* as syntactically parallel to *οī δέ . . .* in l. 6 of this fragment. The last clause of the fragment would then be a separate statement of the goddess, introduced by an explanatory δέ.¹ It would follow, of course, that *πάντων* should be taken as masculine, since the goddess could hardly say that the way of all things was backward-turning. The conclusion is that in all probability the phrase *πάντων . . . κέλευθος* means 'and the path of all (mortals) is backward-turning'. The abruptness resulting from this punctuation need arouse no suspicion; for abruptness is not uncharacteristic of Parmenides.

MICHAEL C. STOKES

the architectural term 'joists' (beams supporting the floor) seems a most unlikely turn of expression for 'floor' or 'ground'. *κροτῶν* may be the clatter as the hands, turned to helpless hooves, seek to manoeuvre the thread or drop to the wooden bench, or as the feet rattle uncomfortably upon the stool; or the word may be *θράνοι* in the genitive, in some phrase now irrecoverable. At any rate it seems clear that if Io needed to come on the stage afterwards (see Pfeiffer's arguments, op. cit., p. 40), scenic conventions would after this description be satisfied by her appearance as a γυνὴ βοῦς, that is with her upper part transformed by head-mask and hoof-gauntlets (the same kind of stage-properties as in *Ach.* 740-5 the Megarian gave to his piglets before popping them in the sack). She is described not as a total heifer but as a seated 'beast-woman'.

That λέανα could be used in this generalized sense is a bold assumption, but I can see no alternative. The word is similarly involved in a mixture of animals in Eur. *Hel.* 375-80, a passage where the grammatical construction is unfortunately obscure, but the main juxtaposition must stand:

ἀ μορφῇ θηρῶν λαχνογυνίων
οἵματι λάβρῳ σχῆμα λεαίνης
ἔξαλλάξασ' ἀλθεὰ λόπης.

see G. M. Crowfoot, 'Of the Warp-weighted Loom', *B.S.A.* xixvii (1936), 36 ff.

¹ See Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 169.

² Not weaving, since the upright loom of ancient Greece kept the weaver standing;

Callisto was traditionally transformed into a bear, and the epithet 'shaggy-limbed' shows unmistakably that Euripides follows the tradition, yet she is the next moment a σχῆμα λεάνης: 'You who in the form of one

of the shaggy wild creatures, a beast-shape in your savage aspect, put off your burden of sorrow.' The words have often been unsuccessfully emended, or deleted, but the two instances now support each other.

Birkbeck College, London

A. M. DALE

TACITUS, ANNALS XV. 44. 3-8

IN § 3, Tacitus has three points to explain; who the Christians were, how they were made scapegoats, and how they were punished. The whole chapter is well constructed, and carefully written; but § 5, which appears to explain *subdidit reos* in § 3, has been the subject of much controversy.

The word *subdidit* implies false accusation, as in *Ann.* i. 6, 6, i. 39, 4, iii. 67, 3, and *Hist.* iii. 25, 1—where we have a phrase similar to *forte an dolo principis* (*Ann.* xv. 38, 1). Thus Tacitus believed that the charge facing the Christians was false; *sontis* in § 8 is therefore sarcastic—the opinion of the *populus*.

Tacitus, if he is consistent, relates an illegal conviction (*haud proinde . . . convicti sunt*). But to what does *qui fatebantur* refer? The problem is discussed by F. W. Clayton (*C.Q.* xli [1947], 81 ff.); his explanation is based on 'the workings of the historian's mind'. But

this assumes that Tacitus had clear and unambiguous sources.

An illegal trial would not be recorded in full, or without ambiguity. Tacitus says that there were two stages; *qui fatebantur* were arrested, and then named others, who were convicted on a false charge—after a confession! We can explain this by supposing that *qui fatebantur* were Neronian agents. Their 'confession' was followed by a specious arrest, and naming of real Christians.

Tacitus' account shows that he did not realize precisely what had happened, but that he felt suspicious. The Neronian government was quite capable of using such methods (e.g. *Ann.* xvi. 17, 5); but the paradox of the Christians' trial in Tacitus' account is best removed by the hypothesis suggested above.

Exeter College, Oxford

K. F. C. ROSE

REVIEWS

LEXICON OF EARLY GREEK EPIC

BRUNO SNELL, ULRICH FLEISCHER, HANS JOACHIM METTE (editors): *Lexikon des fröhlichischen Epos*. 3. Lieferung. Pp. 80. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. Paper, DM. 24.

THE third section of the great Hamburg lexicon of early Greek epic completes the article on *aipéw* and then follows the track of the alphabet almost to the end of the article on *ἀλλά* (the concluding lines of this article, which will appear on the first page of the fourth section, are by a useful innovation printed on the inside of the back cover). As usual the industry of those concerned in the compilation of the single articles, and the skill of the printers, is beyond all praise; and I wish that it were possible to include in this favourable judgement the work of the 'verantwortlicher Redaktor', Dr. Mette. In reviewing the second section of the *Lexikon* (*C.R.*, n.s. vii [1957], 254), I pointed out that the mass of material assembled showed clear signs of making it altogether impossible to carry out the original design of the *Lexikon*, however freely one interpreted the publishers' statement that the completed work would consist of 'etwa 25 Lieferungen zu etwa je 96 Seiten'. That there is much virtue in the word 'etwa' is shown by the fact that the present instalment contains only

80 pages; but even allowing for the practice of the editors in including compounds under the simple verb, a quite elementary sum in proportion suggests that to complete the *Lexikon* on its present scale will require not 'etwa' 2,400 pages, but well over 7,000—and seeing that it has taken five years to reach p. 256, it seems that those who by ordering the first instalment have bound themselves to accept the whole work may have saddled their descendants with an almost indeterminable liability. The article *ἀλλά* shows very plainly what has gone wrong: it occupies the best part of nine closely packed columns, of which rather over three are devoted to metrics (every occurrence listed, with context except for repetitions) and most of the rest to 'Bedeutung', in which again every occurrence is listed, and most have their context quoted (even to the extent of two full lines—for example, *Il.* v. 107 at the end of col. 510). Here, as in other cases, vigorous use of the editorial blue pencil would have been highly desirable.

It is interesting to observe that the logic of the original decision not to adopt Latin as the language of the *Lexikon*, which, owing to the low compression coefficient of the German language, is at least partly responsible for the size of the *Lexikon*, has already led to the admission of articles in French (P. Chantraine, J. Irigoin); this is a development which I think must be viewed with some misgivings, and not least because French is almost as incompressible as German. (Personally I have always regretted that Latin was not made the official language of the Greek *Thesaurus*; not only would the adoption of Latin have ensured that all contributors of whatever nationality would start fair, but it would have produced greater precision in interpretation, especially where related articles are entrusted to contributors of different nationalities.) Let us look here, for example, at Irigoin on *ἀκμή* (col. 417); called upon to account for *Il.* x. 173 ἐνὶ ξυροῦ . . . ἀκμῆς and (indirectly) for *Od.* xxiii. 191 ἀκμηρός, he renders *ἀκμή* as 'pointe, tranchant (fil)'. 'Pointe' can only pass muster if *ἀκμή* is to be invoked later to account for *ἀκμηρός*; but when we turn to the article on *ἀκμηρός* (by Mette himself) all is confusion. We learn that E. Risch in 1937 (*Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, p. 92) explained *ἀκμηρός* as a denominative adjective from *ἀκμή*; but Mette then goes on, 'Risch (brieflich): *a-kmā-no-*, wie *a-kmet-*, *a-kmē-tos* 'nicht ermüdet, nicht geschwächt' (was zu ψ 191 gut passen würde)'—and I think that anyone who has ever set out to translate the description of Odysseus' bed will agree with Mette that Risch's later etymology is very appropriate there. Yet when Mette comes to the section of his article on 'Bedeutung', he gives only 'auf der "Lebensschneide" stehend'; which is to say that, in order to preserve in his rendering the etymology which Risch, it would seem, has already abandoned, Mette has recourse to a metaphor which he must know to be meaningless in the only context with which he is concerned. Here his judgement seems to have failed him twice: his decision as a translator in favour of Risch's first etymology is against the weight of the evidence which he himself adduces, and his decision as editor to let Irigoin's and his own articles be published in their present state is really deplorable.

These are certainly not the only two cases in which Mette has failed to exercise the sort of judgement which one has the right to expect of a 'verantwortlicher Redaktor'. It is, I suppose, conceivable that the explanation is not

¹ The word does not occur again (to judge from *LSJ*, s.v.) until Pausanias v. 15. 6, where it is an epithet of certain nymphs who

had a shrine in the *Embolon* at Olympia. On what 'Lebensschneide' are nymphs to be supposed to stand?

that Mette's own judgement is at fault, but that his powers as 'responsible editor' are so fettered by decisions on policy taken at a higher level that he is unable to exercise his own discretion in such matters as these. Whatever the explanation, the result is the same: the great enterprise in which Mette has such an important part to play is in danger of never reaching its own *άκμη* at all, or (which comes after all to very much the same thing) of not reaching it in the lifetime of anyone now concerned with it.

[Since this notice was written, Fräulein G. Knebel has taken over as 'verantwortliche Redaktorin' from Dr. Mette.]

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

DAILY LIFE IN HOMERIC TIMES

ÉMILE MIREAUX; *Daily Life in the Time of Homer*. Translated by Iris Sells. Pp. 264; map. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959. Cloth, 25s. net.

'The time of Homer', often a meaningless phrase, falls for M. Mireaux between 800 and 600 B.C. His own view, for which the Frenchless reader might have been referred to Myres's summary in *Greece and Rome*, xx-xxi, is that there were two Homers, an original genius who wrote two short epics in the late eighth century, and a brilliant successor who expanded them in the middle of the seventh; both were men of affairs, not interested in 'a past which was already dead', but keen partisans in the commercial and political rivalries of their own day. In 1954, in *La vie quotidienne au temps d'Homère*, now translated by Mrs. Sells, he described the conditions in which the two poets wrote. We are told that 'a description does not permit of a conclusion', but that the Homeric poems show 'the old feudal framework' shaken 'by a fever of rejuvenation'. The reviewer's conclusion is rather that it is wrong to identify the poems with the same stage of history as Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, and the early lawgivers. The Achaeans fade when they are wholly torn from their Mycenaean roots, so that the King of the Pylians is reduced to the chief of his clansmen and their representative in 'dealings with the city authorities'; they are anachronisms in a society of hoplite-farmers and helots, coinage and nascent democracy. The coexistence of the king of golden Mycenae and the Olympic victor of 648 is difficult to credit, especially without benefit of Parry. But even granted the large assumption that all the witnesses are talking about the same society, early Greece is full of pitfalls which an expert on the *Chanson de Roland*, who has also written about liberalism and the credit system, cannot be expected to avoid. Controversial, outdated, or even untenable theories appear as facts: that the Aegina treasure was a tomb group of c. 800; that the foundation deposit at Ephesus was eighth century; that an early Argive law allowed the next of kin to buy back a confiscated estate (hardly deducible even from the supplement tentatively suggested in *A.J.A.* [1901]; see *S.E.G.* xi. 302); that to keep estates together, Spartan brothers practised birth control by sharing a wife; that in the seigniorial manor (which depends for its very existence in this period on the assumption that Homer describes contemporary houses, although such statements as 'the storehouse was generally situated to the north and west of the enclosure' imply some dozen examples) sons were forbidden intercourse with servants; and so through the whole range from the cup of Nestor to feudalism.

There are hardly any exact references except to Homer and Hesiod, and even they are sometimes roughly treated; for instance, beggars are not clearly included among demiourgoi; there is no hint in the *Odyssey* that the tholos, originally a family vault, was used for ancestor worship; the hall of Odysseus cannot have been paved with flagstones or entered by three doors from the prodomos, but his court must have had a second aithousa; and Ajax the Locrian is given the shield of his greater namesake—a slip, but a slip which no one really familiar with the subject could make. The treatment is admirably clear, imaginative, and vigorous; it is a pity that there is so much to criticize in the matter.

No attempt has been made in the translation to cover the work of the five intervening years, and several slips have been introduced. Argus, for instance, becomes the first being on Ithaca to recognize Odysseus, instead of the only one to recognize him at once; harvest is substituted for the autumn sowing (*les semaines*); lecythae, geometric b.f., and two-handled jugs with feet (for pedestal kraters) are more serious; and Helen delightfully becomes the Old Lady showing her souvenirs. The French edition had the prothesis from Athens N.M. 990 on the cover. For Anglo-Saxon taste this is replaced by a vaguely archaic-cum-Hellenistic drawing, but there is an index and a map.

St. Hugh's College, Oxford

D. H. F. GRAY

THE 'BEARBEITER' OF AESCHYLUS

ROBERT BÖHME: *Bühnenbearbeitung äscheischer Tragödien*. 2 vols. Pp. 140, 160. Basel: Schwabe, 1956, 1959. Paper, 12,15 Sw. fr.

It is natural that posthumous production of the plays of Aeschylus should have caused modification of the text. The end of *Septem*, parts of the recognition scene in the *Choephoroi*, and *Eumen.* 405, which gives Athena an alternative mode of entry, have all been explained as additions for subsequent productions. Weil pointed out that Quintilian's famous phrase (x. 1. 66) could cover reworking by later poets as well as mere additions, and now Dr. Böhme, going a great deal farther, suggests that when a later poet (but need it have been a poet?) received from the archon a chorus for a play of Aeschylus he rewrote it in up-to-date style, so that it might compete on level terms with the works of contemporaries. Accordingly the *Oresteia*, as we have it, is a rewriting, perhaps the last of several, for a performance between 408 and 405, and profoundly influenced by the Electra plays of Sophocles and of Euripides. The sort of rewriting he has in mind is illustrated by Phrynicus, *Soph. Praep. Sophist.* 69 ἐπικαττείν καὶ πτερνίζειν . . . λέγοντο δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ παλαιά τῶν δραμάτων μεταποιούντων καὶ μεταρραπτόντων. There is, of course, no indication what δράματα Phrynicus or his source were referring to.

Böhme sees the Aegisthus episode of the *Agamemnon* as the most obvious example of later work. The flatness of the writing has indeed been widely noted. The first lines spoken by Aegisthus 1577–82 are allowed to be authentic Aeschylus—there is no doubt that there is a change of tone at 1583—but they really belong to a dismembered speech of Clytaemnestra which is reconstructed as follows; 1577–82, 1415–18, 1377–98 with the omission of 1379 as being added when the *ekkyklemata* was introduced. With a few verbal changes this can be

made to work as Clytaemnestra's speech proclaiming the murder, our 1372–98. The *μηχανάς* of 1582 will now be the murder of Iphigeneia, and *πατρός* will refer to Agamemnon's hands; cf. 210. It is asserted that this was the speech which Sophocles had before him when he composed *Electra* 525–51, though the correspondence is not strikingly close.

If the Aegisthus scene is added, so too are those passages which prepare for it, the objectionable *λέοντ' ἄνακτιν* 1223–6, and 1434–7. Moreover, since it is now easy to dispense with the third actor, we can remove Cassandra from the stage on Agamemnon's return along with 950–7 and the awkward Clytaemnestra-Cassandra scene 1035–71, though this rather leaves in the air Cassandra's words about knowing Greek at 1254. Finally Agamemnon's death-cries can be removed as an addition based on Sophocles *El.* 1415, 6, and also the twelve couplets of the choreutae, all part of an attempt to lend animation to a static play.

Böhme is not moved only by stylistic considerations in the narrower sense, though much of his argument turns on details of usage. He has an intense conviction that Aeschylus was a poet inspired, continuously sublime, moving only on the heights—or in the depths—of Orphic-Eleusinian religion. Clytaemnestra as avenger of Iphigenia is the simple repository of Justice; her criminal association with Aegisthus was foisted in to give a lubricious thrill to an audience habituated to Euripidean sex plays. Similarly in the *Choephoroi* Orestes in his turn is the avenger possessed by the spirit of his angry father which was conjured from the grave in the course of the *kommos*. This an uncomprehending reviser reduced to a mere interlude when he supplied Orestes with rationalized motives, Apollo's command and his own ambition, and encouraged him with his mother's dream which is a contamination of Stesichorus and Sophocles. With Apollo's oracle Pylades can go too; Clytaemnestra's baring of her breast is decadent melodrama.

The *Eumenides* was even more radically changed. Originally Apollo's function was limited to directing Orestes to Athens, where the *ἀπαλλαγὴ κακῶν* was achieved, not by a trial, but by initiation into the Mysteries. It was in connexion with this ending that Aeschylus was charged with revealing mystic secrets, and consequently the play could not be performed again until another ending, the Aeropagus trial, was substituted. It is suggested that the reference in Orestes' speech to the Argive alliance would be more appropriate in 408 than in 458 when the memory of Argive medism would still be fresh. But it is pretty clear that the name of the play in which Aeschylus offended was not preserved, and that Apsines' *ἐνὶ ταῖς Εὔμενίσι*, on which Böhme founds his theory, was just as much a guess as the five other plays mentioned by the commentator on *Ethics* 1111^a 10.

The assignment to the 'Bearbeiter' of considerable portions of the trilogy is supported by a number of linguistic arguments. Aeschylus's style is notoriously uneven and he is strangely given to repetition of words and phrases, and Böhme makes the most of his case against what he regards as inferior work. But since he rejects as un-Aeschylean all passages which are obviously lively and dramatic, the fact that they have linguistic features in common may mean no more than that he succeeds with a circular argument.

The hypothesis has various intriguing consequences. The new date for the (unrevised) *Supplices* ceases to be surprising, since the *Ur-Oresteia* was equally primitive. If only two actors were used, the ascription in the *Vita* of the introduction of a third actor to Aeschylus can be explained as a mistake of

Alexandrian scholars who mistook their *Oresteia* for the original, and the theory that there was a chorus of twelve was similarly a deduction from 1348–72 of the revised play. Actually the chorus had fifty members until the *Eumenides* (so Pollux), then fifteen, then, as a war-time economy, twelve in the last years of the century; this gives a more rational development than the generally received account.

Böhme's theory with its implication that our *Oresteia* is a composite work, in which it is impossible to isolate the work of Aeschylus with better than rough approximation, is far too disagreeable to win acceptance without the support of overwhelming evidence, and the evidence is far from being that. It is not *prima facie* likely that it would have paid a competing poet to rewrite Aeschylus in this fashion. If our *Oresteia* is hotted-up Aeschylus, it is still very slow Euripides. Where so much is silence the argument *ex silentio* is not of great weight, but one may be surprised that the Alexandrian scholars from whom, presumably, Quintilian got his information transmitted through the scholia no hint of this strange situation. If, as Böhme seems to think, they did not know of the revision, how did Quintilian? In the case at least of *Eum.* 403–5 both versions were preserved side by side. Even if we believe that Aeschylus knew the story of Orestes mainly through its Attic connexion with the celebration of the Choes, it remains inexplicable that he should ignore so large a part of the epic tradition of which he cannot have been unaware. Further, the *Agamemnon* as reconstructed by Böhme is an unsatisfactory work, since Cassandra's revelations lose half their significance if Aegisthus, the child of Thyestes, is eliminated from the story. In the same way the beginning of the *Eumenides* at Delphi becomes a mere episode if Apollo neither has instigated Orestes nor helps towards his acquittal.

The first volume of this work appeared in 1956 and dealt mainly with the first two plays of the Trilogy. With financial assistance it was found possible to publish a second volume in 1959 in which the *Eumenides* is discussed and the rest of the case is largely restated, a form of publication which involves a great deal of repetition.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

SOPHOCLES

ANTONIO MADDALENA: *Sofocle*. Pp. vi. + 419. Turin: Edizioni di 'Filosofia', 1959. Paper, L. 3,000.

THE structure of this book is simple; seven chapters treat of the seven surviving plays and of the plays alone. Neither problems of chronology or of historical background, nor consideration of contemporary moral or religious ideas, distract from the text of the plays. Some fifty pages, and the pages are large, are devoted to each play, followed by a dozen or so pages of closely printed notes, which deal, usually in a critical spirit, with the interpretations of others and defend Sophocles against the insinuations of fault-finders.

Dr. Maddalena's position is firmly held and clearly defined. The plays are about the relations between god and man. Sophocles, no less than Aeschylus, believed that the gods are just, merciful, and benevolent; not only are the wicked punished but the good prosper, or, if they suffer, their sufferings are

compensated, or are a necessary preparation for blessings which follow. He differed from Aeschylus incidentally in that he did not believe the gods themselves to have been perfected by suffering, and more fundamentally in that the gods of Aeschylus might in pursuit of their high purpose will a mortal to commit a crime, while the gods of Sophocles work in a subtler and more ethical manner; they create a situation the consequences of which they can foresee because they know the dispositions of the men who are affected by it. But the responsibility of the human agents is undiminished. It is perhaps significant for Maddalena's attitude that while Aeschylus is often referred to for purposes of comparison, the name of Euripides, if the book had an index, would hardly occur in it.

Seen from this point of view the plays acquire in varying degrees a new look. Ajax was characterized by an excess of pride which was reprehensible and by a nobility which was laudable. The gods set in motion a series of events which purged the pride and in the end gave recognition to the nobility. They caused the competition for Achilles' arms of which they foreknew the result and its effect on Ajax; then they sent madness upon him to prevent his murdering his comrades. In the first passion of despair he is tempted to kill himself, as Jocasta did, to escape from his shame and misery. Indeed, as against the low-grade *ωμφροσύνη* of Tecmessa and the Chorus he is right in thinking that life and honour were incompatible, since life could be purchased only by submission to the Atridae. Later he sees suicide not as escape but as an act of submission to the divine will and of self-purification; so he makes his peace with heaven, and the words of Calchas vouch for it. And in the second part of the play Teucer makes for him his peace with men, and the recognition of his worth is assured.

Love is to Antigone what glory is to Ajax; her offence is not pride but that she belongs to a doomed and accursed house. Once again divine intervention brings to pass the divine purpose. The darkness under cover of which she returns to her brother's body is a trap. Its passing leads to her capture and condemnation. Her sacrifice and suffering lead to her redemption, and she inherits eternal glory—about which the play is strangely silent. The attempt at a theodicy is ineffectual here. And what about the unfortunate Haemon? A similar difficulty arises with the *Trachiniae*. Heracles' sufferings lead naturally enough to the pyre on Oeta and apotheosis, but the only consolation of the innocent Deianeira is that her memory is associated with the glory of Heracles.

Maddalena will not have it that the *Electra* and the *Philoctetes* show a shift of interest in the direction of the exploration of character for its own sake. Clytaemnestra is very properly put to death in obedience to an unquestionable divine command. Orestes is the emotionally uncommitted executioner, Electra the passionate witness to her mother's depravity. It is admitted that the structure of the play is peculiar in that the principal character makes no effective contribution to the outcome of the action, a fact which might justify some second thoughts as to the theme of the play. Philoctetes is another example of the innocent sufferer who suffers for his own good, and thus prepares himself for the glory of being Troy's captor. It is not clear whether the impurity from which he is purged is the impurity which attaches to him *qua* human being or the ritual impurity which is mistakenly attributed to him on the strength of lines 8-11 of the play.

The Emporos scene in the *Philoctetes* is the subject of a novel suggestion. It is not to be explained, as it is by many, as a technical device to increase tension.

It shows how the cleverness of Odysseus overreaches itself in conformity with the divine purpose. But for the partly bogus information conveyed in this scene to Philoctetes he would have been less taken aback by the onset, divinely timed, of sickness, since he would not have known that he was a hunted man likely to be caught while helpless. It is this belief which leads him to entrust the bow to Neoptolemus, and this act with its appeal to the nobler impulses in the distracted mind of Neoptolemus leads ultimately to the defeat of Odysseus.

The *O.T.* and the *O.C.* form the subject of the last two chapters, not because Maddalena supposes this to show the true chronological relation between the plays, but because he believes that for both plays the same presuppositions must be adopted, that the cult of the hero Oedipus was familiar to all, and that from the moment when Oedipus appeared before his plague-stricken people the audience was mindful of the grave at Colonus. Accordingly the problem of undeserved suffering is in some measure solved, or at least evaded. It is known from the start that purity of spirit will in the end redeem the impurity of the body.

In spite of a few eccentricities Maddalena's careful study of the plays will take its place in the Sophocles 'literature'. To those of a different way of thinking the value of the work as a whole will be affected by the insistence that the plays are mainly a vehicle for the expression of theological convictions, though this bias may be partly due to the character of the series in which the book appears. But Maddalena attributes to Sophocles something very like a doctrine of original sin without ever stopping to ask whether it would have been intelligible to an audience which, however conscious of the danger of particular impurities, was unaware that it was contaminated from birth; and he persists in taking for granted the notion that suffering may be of positive spiritual value, though it is far from clear that the ordinary Greek believed anything more recondite than that those who learnt painfully were the most likely to remember their lesson.

It remains to mention a point which concerns publisher rather than author. We are becoming accustomed in books printed in the United States to the extensive employment of the Latin alphabet for single Greek words, the use of which by those who know no Greek seems to be credited with a strange efficacy. Maddalena occasionally quotes sentences or lines from Sophocles which cannot possibly interest those who cannot read Greek script, yet they are printed in the Latin alphabet with accents but no breathings, a sight that is quite horrible. The practice can yield only the most trifling economies, and probably most readers would prefer to forgo the quotations altogether.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

MIDDLE COMEDY

J. M. EDMONDS: *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*. Vol. ii: *Middle Comedy*. Pp. 683. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Cloth, fl. 70.

EDMONDS's second volume contains mostly the same fragments as Kock's. The most important difference is the absence here of Philemon and Diphilus; Edmonds has sensibly reverted to the tripartite division of Comedy, which Kock (following Fielitz) abandoned.

In aiming to provide an edition useful both to the specialist and to the general student of literature who knows no Greek, Edmonds set himself a difficult, perhaps an impossible, task and unfortunately can hardly be said to have succeeded; both classes of reader will miss much essential material. For the specialist, no edition will supersede Kock unless it has an apparatus giving an adequate summary of earlier work on these fragments; here many important conjectures, by such scholars as Dobree and Cobet as well as Meineke and Kock, are not mentioned. For example, it is relevant (even for the general reader) that Dobree proposed a change of speaker at Antiphanes fr. 52. 15 init. The names of emenders (including Edmonds himself) are regularly suppressed. Moreover, space could have been saved in the apparatus by greater conciseness and by omitting notes on minor technical points like Antiphanes fr. 161. 8 (*λάβωσ'* for *λάβων*) or *ibid.* 10 (*δόμης* for *δόμητος*). The general reader will need far more notes on the subject-matter than can be accommodated here, although he gets some valuable help, notably the extracts from Apollodorus prefixed to plays with a mythological subject. But this problem is perhaps insoluble, except by editing text and translation in separate volumes, each with its own corpus of notes.

In addition it may be doubted if the new text represents an advance on Kock. In the first place, the task of revising and bringing the work up to date has not been done quite thoroughly. The fragment of Alexis' *Hesione* contained in Pap. Ox. 1801 (1922) is omitted, and, to take a smaller point, we are not told that Antiphanes fr. 265 survives also on a papyrus (*Gr. Lit. Pap.* [Berlin, 1950], pp. 57-58, cf. Alfonsi in *Aegyptus*, xxxiii [1953], p. 310). At Antiphanes fr. 326 Edmonds disarmingly admits that he has given the reference 'Maximus Confessor 41 p. 64' on Kock's authority but cannot find it himself. The reference (which Kock copied from Meineke) is indeed misleading; '41 p. 64' refers to the compilation of excerpts from the anthologies of Maximus and Antonius 'Melissa' which forms the appendix to the Geneva edition of Stobaeus (1609) and this particular quotation is from Antonius, Migne cxxxvi, p. 900.

Nor can we report much definite progress in emendation: the nineteenth century left few fragments uncorrected except those too deeply corrupted for anything more than *exempli gratia* restoration, and those which cannot be corrected without their contexts. Though there is less arbitrary conjecture in this volume than in its predecessor, there is still some pretty doubtful Greek, quite apart from forms like the crasis *τοῦν* (= τὸ δν) at Antiphanes fr. 122. 14, or the oversight which has produced a spondaic fourth foot at Antiphanes fr. 159. 10. For example, Antiphanes fr. 140. 3 (4 in Edmonds, as he inserts a conjectural line after 2) reads *μαλακῶς σφόδρα λίαν μέλιτι προσπαῖζεν βίᾳ* and is translated 'Very kindly; needn't make [his italics] me play with honey' with a note 'apparently a proverbial remark equivalent to "I need no pressing there"', or Eubulus fr. 104 ad fin., where the text seems arbitrary. At times, too, Edmonds (like some of his predecessors) seems to pay insufficient attention to the requirements of the context; e.g. Nicostratus fr. 36 (apud Cramer, *A.P.* 4. 114. 11) is quoted in a note on reduplication, and most probably *ἔδιακόνει* should be altered to *δεδιακόνηκε*. To take a much harder example, at Antiphanes fr. 122. 12 we need an argument to prove that even things which arise from themselves are non-existent, e.g. *εἰ δὲ ἀντόθεν πῃ γέγονεν, οὐκ ἔσται πόθεν | καὶ ποῖ γὰρ τοῦ ἀν εἴη; πόθεν γενήσεται | οὐκ ὅν ποτ' εἰς ὅν; καὶ γὰρ οὐ δυνήσεται.*

Chronological problems too are sometimes arbitrarily handled, and the heading to the time-chart 'Dated and Conjecturally Datable Plays of the Middle Comedy', with its implication that the certain is distinguished from the uncertain, is misleading. For example, the time-chart contains the entry 308 L(enaea) Alexis 'Ιμιλκων, with no query. To attain this result Edmonds has first emended the corrupt title *Milken* at Ath. 354 d; then historical considerations (not without some uncertainty on the way) lead us to a choice between 308 and 340. He then adopts 308, because 340 is already booked up in the time-chart for Alexis. Sometimes the dating depends on assuming a particular allusion in a fragment, as in Alexis Θέσπια or *Λοκρόι*, where a lengthy quotation from Dem. *Timocr.* 139 is given because 'this passage may have given Alexis the idea for his play; if so, its date is 352'. Questions of authorship also are arbitrarily treated, e.g. the papyrus published by Wilamowitz in *Sitz. d. k. Preuss. Ak. Wiss.* 1918 (Page, p. 234), is assumed to be from Alexis, and certain plays of Antiphanes (*Δίδυμοι*, *Δνούρωτες*, and *Παρεκδιδομένη*) are assigned to 'Antiphanes Junior' without adequate argument, though there is a real chronological problem in fr. 81 K; but it is also significant that Athenaeus always distinguishes between Cratinus senior and junior.

The translation, in verse, is neat, lively, readable, and on the whole accurate. There are some avoidable errors, like the mistranslation of ὅ γε νῦν γίγνεται Antiphanes fr. 122.7, a few inconsistencies with the text (e.g. Strato fr. 1. 19), occasional obscurities due to textual difficulties (e.g. Antiphanes fr. 52. 16-17), and a pardonable tendency to compress fragments into self-contained epigrams, e.g. Alexis fr. 128.

As in the first volume, there are many misprints; although fewer of those in this volume are serious, there are still a few inaccuracies in the text, e.g. Alexis fr. 302. 2 omission of ἐγώ before τεκμαίρομαι, Anaxandrides fr. 52. 2 omission of χούτω before γαμεῖ.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

MENANDER, *DYSKOLOS*

JEAN BINGEN: Menander, *Dyskolos*. (Textus Minores, vol. xxvi.) Pp. xvi + 52. Leiden: Brill, 1960. Paper, fl. 5.50.

CARLO DIANO: Menandro: *Dyskolos ovvero sia il Selvatico*. (Proagones: Testi, vol. i.) Pp. 142. Padua: Antenore, 1960 (cover), 1959 (title-page). Paper.

CARLO DIANO: *Note in margine al Dyskolos di Menandro*. (Proagones: Studi, vol. i.) Pp. 77. Padua: Antenore, 1959. Paper.

H. J. METTE: Menandros: *Dyskolos*. Pp. 32. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960. Paper, DM. 4.80.

J. H. QUINCEY, W. RITCHIE, G. P. SHIPP, A. P. TREWEEK: *Notes on the Dyskolos of Menander*. Pp. 12. Adelaide: Australian Humanities Research Council, 1960 (obtainable in the U.K. from International University Booksellers, 39 Store St., London, W.1.) Paper.

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *The Birth of Modern Comedy*. Pp. 13. Adelaide:

Australian Humanities Research Council, 1960 (obtainable as above).
Paper.

THE cost of the *editio princeps* of the *Dyscolus* would in itself be sufficient reason that scholars should be anxious to lose no time in producing other texts. The three here noticed are not indeed the earliest, yet they are all too early not to have been overtaken in many places, and so much continues to be published on the play that it is hard to know what comments will still be of interest when this review is published. Accordingly I shall attempt general characterization more than detailed discussion.

All three editions share many widely made corrections of the *editio princeps*; none does much to record conjectures not adopted by the editor. Professor Bingen claims sole authorship of about seventy changes or supplements, some of the latter being only *exempli gratia*. Some of them he has explained in *Chronique d'Égypte*, xxxiv (1959). Here are a few examples of lines he can propose or defend:

235 τὸν τῇ κόρῃ <ταῦτη> προσιόνθ' δοτις ποτ' ήν [as if any identification were needed!]

350 ἴσως ἔρεινα . . .

472 Γε . . . αἰτησόμενος λεβήτιον. Κυ. λεβοίτιον; Γε. λεβοίτιον; [a joke]

736 τὰλλα πράτ' (for sale) αὐτὸς παραβών—νοῦν ἔχεις, σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς/κηδεμῶν εἰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς εἰκότως—

897 τοδὶ <γ' ἔκρι>να πρῶτον [nothing could be more certain than τὸ δεῖνα of ed. princ.].

Only perhaps in punctuation and assignment of speeches is this text superior to the others. A necessary minimum of information about the text of the papyrus is given. Stage directions are confined to exits other than those at the end of 'scenes'. There is a brief English introduction, where it surprised me to read that 'tragic parody is perceptible throughout the *Dyscolus*'.

Professor Diano's edition is the first of a planned series of classical studies and texts, to have the general title of *Proagones*. It is accompanied by a volume of notes in which he explains and supports his readings and interpretations; these notes are supplemented and modified in *Maia*, n.s. iv (1959), 326–41. The Greek text is followed by a translation in Italian prose, with stage directions suitable for the modern reader, unaccustomed as he is to the effort of imagining action on the basis of the words. As Diano is an experienced editor of Epicurean papyri, his readings of this papyrus deserve attention. 44: rightly rejecting *js*, he thinks *ju* certain; it fits the exiguous traces, but the absence of an apostrophe tells somewhat against it, and his supplement *τὸ λᾶjμu'* brings a word from too elevated a sphere; *ja* appears to be an alternative. 206: *τοι*; I still see *γοι*. 243: *ἀξ[ο]νώμεθα* will hardly do for sense, yet I agree that neither *μ* in the usually accepted *μ[ι]νώμεθα* is very plausible. 247: *τι*, but one would expect to see the cross-bar of *τ*, ligatured with *ι*. 348: *οὐδέν γι'*, but the alleged trace of an apostrophe is too low. 446: the apostrophe before *οικ* need not force us to abandon *μετ]οικοδομήσειν* for *αὐ γι' οικ.*; cf. 529, *μετ'εστρεφομην*. 663: *γ' [ἀν τ]ύχοι* is wrong; once pointed out, *τ[ω θ]εωι* carries conviction. 544 ff.; the supplements here, and not here only, fail to fit the space; from 546 almost everyone writes *τι τὸ κ]ακόν*; *οἰει χείρας ἐξήκοντά με,*] *ἄνθρ]ωπ'*, *ἔχειν*, but he prints (partly with *ed. princ.*) *δι]ακόνει. <δ>ει χείρας ἐξήκοντά με, / ὅπ]ωπ', ᔁχειν*.

The lack of feeling for Menander's style illustrated by the last proposal is unfortunately not an isolated instance. Diano has found many admirable corrections and supplements that have also occurred to others, but I do not feel inclined to accept any of the numerous suggestions peculiar to him. Of these

latter sixteen contain the word δῆ, almost equalling the number of instances which, in the rest of the play, come from Menander's pen. But enterprise is balanced by caution: he defends the papyrus against would-be emenders at 257, 409, 466, 577, 641, 769, 773, 790, 898. I still think that at all these places a change is necessary, but at some less confidently than before. None of these three editors is a foe of broken anapaests; Diano not only retains those of the papyrus, but introduces others by conjecture at 193, 275, 324, 416, 817. Like Bingen, he thinks the second syllable of Παλαινῖ short, an opinion not shared by Philip of Macedon, who danced, in his cups to be sure, to the words

Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους Παλαινῖς τάδ' εἶπεν.

Professor Mette has been more concerned to collect other scholars' suggestions and less partial to, or happier with, his own. For this reason his edition is, in spite of some weaknesses of punctuation and assignment of parts, the best buy for a reader who wants a text which will not hold him up as he reads. At the same time he has set himself the admirable but difficult object of printing what will at once make sense and give the student a fair idea of what is in the papyrus, of combining in fact a transcript and a text. Even though no attempt is or could be made to represent the papyrus's punctuation or accentuation, this makes an intricate piece of printing, in which one could hardly expect complete accuracy at the first attempt. For example, I should write at v. 8 ζ[ῶ]ν not ζῶν, v. 31 ἀ{ι}ε[ι or ἀ{ι}ε[*i*] not ἀ{ι}ε[*i*], at v. 168 ΣΩΣΤΡΑ. not ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤ. These may be matters of opinion, but at v. 436 we need at least εὐτρ{:}επῆ and in my view <:εὐτρ{:}επῆ (the dicolon is before the wrong ε), at 943 στιβάδας not στιβάδας. At 420 εὐπρεπεῖς is presumably a misprint for εὐπρεπεῖς. No doubt these and other corrections will come to light through use of the text in a seminar. A matter of principle that might be reconsidered is the printing of the paragraphus in appropriate places under a supplement. The practice makes it impossible to distinguish 925, where the paragraphus is preserved but not the initial letters of the line, and 924, where both the letters and the paragraphus are conjectural. It should also be recognized that the scribe uses the dicolon to indicate change of addressee as well as change of speaker; thus at 177 after οὐνέδρου it means, not 'SOSTR.', but 'To himself', and there is quite rightly no paragraphus under the line; similarly at 213, where there is, however, also a change of speaker in the same line, and therefore a paragraphus.

Mette's stage directions give all entrances and exits. I do not understand why at 232 he makes Daos enter Gorgias' house when his expressed intention is to fetch him from working in his fields, nor why Gorgias when fetched should emerge from his house. At 619 Mette shares with some other scholars the view that Gorgias enters his house with Daos; it is better to suppose that, assuring Daos that he will be home before long, he accompanies Sostratus into the shrine, having been invited by him to share his lunch. Hence when he appears in answer to Simicē's cries at 635, Sostratus, already alerted, can instantly respond to a summons. The question how the parts were distributed between the actors is a difficult one. Mette has a useful plan showing how they could be divided among six actors, and this is, I believe, the minimum if we insist, according to modern practice, that no part may be divided between two actors. On the other hand, G. P. Goold has shown in *Phoenix*, xiii (1959), how the play could be performed by three speaking actors. It is perhaps dangerous to

argue that what could have been done was done, or was done whenever or wherever the play was performed. It may be as rash to suppose that a dramatist would avoid giving a small speaking part (e.g. the girl in this play) to a man who was elsewhere used as a non-speaking actor as it is to deny that he could divide a part between two actors.

Two papers from Australia speak well for the activity of classical studies there. Professor's Webster's lecture, delivered on a visit, contains matter both for the scholar and for the general public. The latter are given a summary of the *Dyscolus*, and an account of the differences in spirit and staging between Old and New Comedy; for the former there are detailed references to archaeological evidence for the problems of masks and costume. The speculations on the descent of the plot of the *Dyscolus* (and other comedies) from 'some ritual for the release of the winter-bound earth' are a tribute to the shades of the greatest Australian-born Hellenist.

The other paper naturally contains many suggestions that have been duplicated in Europe or America, and others which, though possible, are not the most plausible that have been made, but the general level of taste and scholarship is high. A minor, but typically acute proposal is to supplement 301 εὐ γέ δέσποθ', οὐτω πολλά [μοι (not [σοι]) ἀγαθὰ γένονται, which neatly contrasts with the previous speaker's οὐτως εὐτυχοίς. The most important contribution is Ritchie's argument that Sostratus' mother has a speaking part in 430 ff. If this is accepted—and I think Mette is right to accept it—it follows that the assignment of speeches in the papyrus need not go back to the author or even to a reliable tradition. The fact that the papyrus, in contrast to its fullness in the previous scene, gives practically no help over problems of assignment in 880 ff. may mean that they were just as baffling to ancient as to modern editors. The division of speeches, by dicola and paragraphi, is a different matter; it may have no better authority, but it is prudent to treat it as derived from a genuine tradition, departing from it only if a substantial advantage is to be gained. Such a departure may indeed be called for in 430 ff. Ill informed as we may be about the language of good-class Athenian matrons, surely ποι κέχηνας, ἐμβρόντητέ ουν; is unexpected in Sostratus' mother's mouth, and if the words are directed to Plangon, why should the bride-to-be suffer this gratuitous abuse? I think the words must be addressed by Getas *sotto voce* to Cnemon, who is the one person on the stage whom it well suits to stand gaping. With less conviction I suggest that it is Cnemon who at 435 interjects ὦ 'Ηράκλεις, ἀηδίας—hardly a weak word that could pass as a pardonable impertinence from Getas to his mistress (cf. L.S.J. s.v.), and that the whole of 438 should be assigned to the mother, punctuating τὸ γοῦν πρόβατον—μικροῦ τέθηκε γάρ, τάλαν—οὐ περιμένει τὴν σήν σχολήν.

Trinity College, Cambridge

F. H. SANDBACH

ANCIENT THEATRICAL PRODUCTION

PETER D. ARNOTT: *An Introduction to the Greek Theatre*. Pp. xvi+240; 7 plates. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 21s. net.

DR. ARNOTT achieves very satisfactorily the purpose which he sets himself, to supply to Greekless readers the minimum of knowledge necessary for an

intelligent reading of Greek drama. Those for whom it is intended will find the book extremely helpful. Many of the statements it contains are hazardous, but it is impossible to give an account of ancient theatrical production which will command wide agreement, and Arnott is careful not to give the impression that his conclusions are better founded than in fact they are. But it may well be objected that the book attempts to cover an excessive amount of ground and that it contains too many anecdotes which, though hallowed by tradition, are unlikely to be true.

Arnott, writing as a producer, begins by emphasizing the variety of conventions which have at different times been found acceptable and gives a sensible summary of the conditions of performance at Athens. This, the first quarter of the book, is the best part. Next we have a short account of Early Tragedy as exemplified by the *Agamemnon*, of Later Tragedy with the *Medea* as the typical play, of Satyric Drama and the *Cyclops*, and of Greek Comedy and its Roman imitations. Finally we have some notes on translation, which are well judged but scrappy, and some account of modern productions of Greek plays. On this scale Arnott cannot really do justice to himself or the subject. He attributes to Aeschylus far too crude a conception of divine jealousy. It is dubious whether the *Cyclops* deserves a whole section to itself, and in any case we know too little about the standards of Satyric Drama for it to be safe to assert that this play is hastily written.

A permanent raised stage is accepted as part of the fifth-century theatre, but the *mechane* is denied to Aeschylus and both the *ψυχορασία* and the first entrance of the Chorus in the *P.V.* are supposed to take place on the roof of the stage building. The *ekkyklema* is allowed for the later plays of Aeschylus, but the sketch plans show a stage so lacking in depth that the *ekkyklema*, when in operation, would cut it in two and the position of the stage altar would make its use from the centre door almost impossible. It is probably correct that 'the notion of inside and outside are lost when the *έκκ.* is in use', but it would be interesting to know at what point Clytaennestra is supposed to descend from it before walking off with Aegisthus. The size of the theatre and its effect on the style of acting are rightly stressed, though it might have been added that speed of dialogue and some agility on the part of the actors are presupposed by the plays, especially by comedy. The statement that actors appeared only four inches high to spectators in the front row and one inch to those at the back has no clear meaning, and one may suspect that if it had it would be misleading.

There are a number of points which should be elucidated or corrected in a second edition. The *Septem* does not begin with a scene between actor and Chorus (p. 20). Rain is not 'rare in Greece' at the time of year when the dramatic festivals took place; indeed snow was not unknown (p. 32). The three unities are not even 'listed' by Aristotle (p. 39). There is no reason to suppose a change of scene at the end of Euripides' *Suppliants* (p. 40). There is no debate over the body of Ajax in Sophocles as to who shall inherit his armour (p. 42). Heracles may have been a familiar figure in comedy and satyr-play; he was not in tragedy (p. 49). One of Euripides' sons produced some of his father's plays after his death, but this does not justify his being called 'a producer' (p. 51). Socrates did not stand up in the theatre during the performance of the *Clouds* to show the badness of the actor's mask, but to show strangers who Socrates was (p. 57); but to read the lamentable chapter of Aelian which is the source of the story is to see that it is not worth quoting. Given the

dimensions of the Theatre of Dionysus, Cassandra cannot have been 'revealed' to more than a small proportion of the audience when Agamemnon got down from his chariot (p. 79). Aristophanes did not win 'only four first prizes'; four of his plays are thought to have won first prizes, but there is no record of the total number of his victories (p. 133).

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia. Edidit VITTORIO BARTOLETTI. Pp. xxxv+75. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth, DM. 5. 60.

THIS second Teubner edition of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* supersedes that of E. Kalinka (1927), which was reviewed by E. M. Walker in *C.R.* xlvi (1928), 182. Happily it is not a revision of the first edition but an entirely new work. Much has been written about the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* since 1927, and, more important, some substantial new fragments, undoubtedly belonging to the same work and describing episodes in the Decelean war, have come to light. The papyrus containing these fragments, which is now in Florence, was discovered in 1934, but, rather mysteriously, its contents remained unknown to scholars until 1949, when it was published by Bartoletti himself in *Papiri greci e latini*, xiii. 61–81. This Florentine papyrus and the well-known London papyrus, first published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908, are here conveniently united, the chapters being numbered continuously. They have not previously been published together except in the edition, with introduction and commentary, by M. Gigante (Rome, 1949), which Bartoletti reviewed unfavourably in *Gnomon*, xxii (1950), 380–4.

The preface, though longer than that of Kalinka, follows the Teubner tradition of brevity. After describing both papyri and listing the errors and omissions in each Bartoletti considers the order of the fragments. Three disputed points are studied in some detail. His conclusions on the first two are attractive and may well be right, but his view that the person whose virtues are described in 14. 2 is the younger Cyrus seems no more convincing than earlier suggestions. The longest section of the preface, in which the problem of authorship is examined, will be discussed below.

The bibliography (pp. xxvii–xxxiv) lists nearly 200 works by more than 100 scholars published in many countries (including Czarist Russia) during the half-century since 1908. Some recent work on the Boeotian constitution is not included, notably J. A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History* (1955), pp. 31–40.

In his text Bartoletti has wisely adopted a conservative policy (p. xxvi). Kalinka printed many lengthy and highly conjectural restorations, a practice condemned by Walker (*loc. cit.*). Bartoletti is much more cautious. His own restorations are few but excellent: examples are $\chi\epsilon\mu\hat{\alpha}\nu]$ (9. 1, p. 9, l. 10; cf. p. xv), $\delta\rho\chi\acute{o}n\tau\omega]\nu$ (15. 1, p. 21, l. 10), and $\chi\acute{a}\lambda\epsilon\pi]\hat{\omega}s$ (20. 6, p. 32, l. 8). The supplement $\delta\omega\acute{a}\sigma\tau\eta s$ (9. 2, p. 10, l. 16), which Bartoletti takes from Diodorus (xiv. 79. 8), is less convincing: this substantive was not common in prose when the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* was written but is a favourite with Diodorus, who is probably responsible for it here. The text is followed by 18 pages of *testimonia*,

arranged much more conveniently than those of Kalinka, and by an *index verborum*.

In the section of the preface entitled 'De Auctore' (pp. xvii–xxv) Bartoletti hints that the formidable task of trying to deal adequately with the vexed question of authorship within the limits available to him has caused him some embarrassment (p. xix). He summarizes the essentials of the problem with clarity and fairness, but these pages hardly bear comparison with the brief but admirable survey by G. T. Griffith in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (1954), pp. 160–2. Bartoletti gives lists of well-known scholars who have sponsored the claims of the various candidates (p. xx), and he prints in full the four passages from which all that is known about Cratippus is derived (pp. xxi–xxiii): had he dispensed with either or both, he could have discussed fundamental issues more fully. His own conclusion, expressed with commendable reserve, is that the author is probably Cratippus, though he does not entirely exclude the possibility that the work was written by some historian whose name has not survived. He makes no reference to the argument whereby H. Bloch seeks to prove that Cratippus cannot be the author (*Harv. Stud.*, Suppl. Vol. i [1940], 313)—an argument that surely involves putting too much faith in the accuracy and consistency of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Not all scholars will share even the limited confidence of Bartoletti that the author was an Athenian (p. xviii).

The controversy has had a curious history. Some of the opinions put forward soon after the publication of the London papyrus now seem surprising. It is today hard to understand how anyone can have seriously believed that Theopompus wrote the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. Yet this view was supported by many scholars of great eminence led, or rather misled, by Eduard Meyer, whom Bartoletti justly describes in another connexion as 'vir ille sagacissimus' (p. xv). The sponsors of Ephorus, who has now been almost more decisively eliminated, were hardly less distinguished. Although it would be gratifying if the identity of the Oxyrhynchus historian could be established, the debate has lost much of its importance. If, as is now almost universally agreed, the author is not Theopompus or Ephorus, or indeed Androtion, it is of relatively little consequence whether he is Cratippus or Daimachus or X, because Cratippus and Daimachus are scarcely more than ghosts. This fascinating but almost hopeless pursuit of the author, though it has yielded valuable results on the negative side, has tended to bedevil the study of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, which might profitably turn in other directions. The author is a competent and most conscientious historian who derives his material from the best possible sources, makes an effort to interpret it impartially, and presents it clearly, but somehow lacks distinction in thought and style. He is a second-rate Thucydides, seeking to follow the narrative methods of his master without fully appreciating their subtlety. For anyone attempting further investigations on such aspects of his work as his selection and arrangement of material, his interest in causation, his treatment of leading characters, his use of digressions and his language, Bartoletti has forged a most serviceable and reliable tool.

THE SCHOOL OF ARISTOTLE

FRITZ WEHRLI: *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar.* Heft x. Pp. 200. Basel: Schwabe, 1959. Paper, 32 Sw. fr.

THE tenth and final part of this work contains the texts for Hieronymus of Rhodes, Critolaus, Ariston the younger, and Diodorus of Tyre, together with a survey of the history of the Peripatos in the pre-Christian period. There are also indexes (1) of names and subjects mentioned in the text, (2) of names and subjects mentioned in the commentary, (3) of passages given in the text, (4) titles of works by individual Peripatetics, and (5) a concordance of the numbering of the fragments used by Wehrli and by other editors. There is no index of Greek words as such and this will be regretted by some. But there are so few fragments which are certainly direct quotations that it is doubtful what significance a full index would have had. Its purpose is partly fulfilled by the inclusion of a small number of technical terms in indexes 1 and 2. It is a pity that these were not made more extensive by including more terms and by fuller entries for words included. For example, we have Entelechie with a reference to Strato in Index 2, but no reference in 1 or 2 to ἐνδελέχεια or ἐντελέχεια in Critolaus fr. 15 under either of these words, although there is a reference under Seele. There should have been a reference under Entelechie whatever be the authenticity of the fragment in question. At the end of the book there are three pages of addenda, giving a few extra fragments for authors dealt with in earlier parts and one additional note.

None of the authors dealt with in the present part is of the first importance. Hieronymus of Rhodes in the third century B.C. abandoned distinctively Aristotelian doctrines, notably in ethics and perception, to such an extent that many have supposed that he founded a separate School of his own. This Wehrli would deny on the ground that the Peripatos had no particular dogmatic requirements. Critolaus was a member of the famous embassy to Rome in 156–155 B.C. He preserved or reintroduced an element of metaphysical speculation into the School after the pattern of the *De Philosophia*, and attacked contemporary rhetoric. Wehrli has secured revised texts of the fragments from the Herculanean papyri of Philodemus previously edited by Sudhaus, though they remain regrettably very difficult to read and interpret.

The Rückblick of 33 pages dealing with the history of the Peripatos makes no attempt to rival, for example, Brink's article on Peripatos in Pauly-Wissowa, Supp. vii, nor does it deal again with detailed points covered in the commentary. It is rather an essay in interpretation, and is addressed primarily to the question why the history of the Peripatos followed the lines which it did. The fragments in *Die Schule des Aristoteles* reveal what Wehrli is fully justified in calling a process of disintegration and the reasons for this are hard to find. It cannot be explained as due to any general historical movement—it took place during the period of the creative efforts of the Stoa and the Garden, and it did not apply, at least to anything like the same extent, to the Academy. Why then should such a fate have befallen the philosophy of Aristotle, which had some claims to be regarded as the highest peak reached in ancient thought? Wehrli gives a fairly definite answer of considerable interest. He argues that the real reason lay in certain features of Aristotle's own work. First, there is

the fact that this was not expressed in a single body of canonical writings but developed and changed as between the Dialogues and the Treatises so that the relation between the two constituted a problem for his successors. (There is in fact very little reference to any such problem in the surviving fragments. Wehrli would cite Critolaus fr. 25, but the evidence there is very weak.) After Strato and Eudemus the School in fact followed the pattern of approach suggested by the Dialogues. As a result the system-building ideas of the Treatises were neglected. Secondly, Wehrli speaks of a tendency towards Empiricism in Aristotelianism which he regards as in its own right tending towards disintegration and is inclined to contrast in this respect with the Platonic metaphysic. The attempt to apply this empiricism completed the process of disintegration amongst Aristotle's successors.

The weakness in this analysis is first of all that it describes rather than explains. Why should it have been just these aspects of Aristotle's work which attracted the attention of his successors? It was not the case with later revivals of Aristotle, whether ancient or modern. Secondly, if Wehrli seriously means that all empiricism is self-destructive, a view which he seems at times to suggest, this is very unlikely to secure general assent. Even if the argument is confined to the particular kind of empirical interest found in Aristotle, there seems no very obvious reason why this should have promoted disintegration. It could have itself been systematized.

The ten parts of this work have appeared over a period of fifteen years, and the cost of a complete set of the parts is 144 Swiss francs (say £12), which is high but not, perhaps, excessive for a work of this character. We are all grateful both to author and to publisher for the successful completion of the original design. *τὸ δργανόν ἐστιν ἐνεκα τοῦ ἔργου* was a doctrine of the School and we have now an instrument available for many pieces of further work.

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFORD

ANCIENT LECTURE NOTES ON THE PHILEBUS

L. G. WESTERINK: Damascius, *Lectures on the Philebus*. Pp. xxii+149. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1959. Cloth, 45s.

WITH the commentaries of Olympiodorus on some of Plato's dialogues there has come down to us a hitherto anonymous collection of lecture-notes on the *Philebus*. It has usually, for want of a more precise ascription, been cited as a work of Olympiodorus, though scholars have, of course, recognized that, at least fundamentally, it goes back to earlier sources; and certain parallels with Damascius have been noticed that both in their form and in their content seem to suggest that the writer of these notes may have excerpted a work (or lectures) of Plato's last successor in Athens. Mr. Westerink, to whom we already owe other valuable contributions to the study of the unjustly neglected field of Neoplatonist commentators on Plato and Aristotle, here offers an edition of the text together with an English translation and notes. He argues, with much justice, that the ascription in the manuscripts to Olympiodorus (*Σχόλια εἰς τὸν Πλάτωνος Φίληβον ἀπὸ φωνῆς Ὄλυμπιοδάρου τοῦ μεγάλον φιλοσόφου*) must be an unintentional forgery modelled on the title of Olympiodorus' commentary on

but the *Alcibiades*; and apart from this there is no indication of any connexion with Olympiodorus.

On the other hand, there are indications in the work that seem to connect it with Damascius. Thus, it had already been suggested by Beutler (P.-W., s.v. 'Olympiodorus', cols. 218-19) that the expression ὁ ἡμέτερος καθηγημάτων in various passages in which earlier commentators are criticized referred to Damascius; but he thought that the expression was used by the lecturer about his source; while Westerink now suggests that it refers to the lecturer himself (i.e. Damascius) and that it is used by the student taking down, or excerpting, the lecture notes. The question is of more than incidental interest; for on it depends the ascription of the authorship of this work. On the other hand, it seems clear, from Westerink's argument, that even if that ascription were not entirely acceptable, the bulk of the work has obvious affinities with Damascius. Thus, in addition to similarities in diction, formulae, and methods with other work of Damascius, there are a good number of passages where (so Westerink argues convincingly) the notes contain a criticism of Proclus' views; and many of these criticisms can be shown with certainty to coincide with known views of Damascius.

Students of Plato as well as of later Greek philosophy will be grateful to Westerink for this painstaking and careful work; his translation seems to be accurate, idiomatic, and clear; though there are one or two places where one might disagree with his interpretation.

44: πλήθη = 'manifolds' rather than 'multitudes'. 47: . . . μενεῖ ἐν καὶ γενήσει *ἐν* τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπιβάλλον αὐτοῖς τι τουτοῦ, ' . . . it will remain one and reproduce itself in the many according to their capacity' (Westerink); should we not rather translate ' . . . it will remain one and generate oneness in the many by investing them with that sort of character'? (If the addition of *ἐν* [West.] is acceptable, perhaps we may add *ἐν* as well: . . . γενήσει *ἐν* *ἐν* τοῖς . . . 70: ἐνεργεία (here contrasted with δύναμις) Westerink translates 'activity'. No, rather 'actuality'. 91. . . . ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπανθόν τῷ ἀθροίσματι, 'something superimposed on the aggregate' (Westerink); better, perhaps, 'something that supervenes (additionally) on the aggregation'. ἐπανθέω here = ἐπιγίγνεσθαι, συνέπεσθαι: cf. 233, where Westerink quotes Aristotle, *De Part. An. i. 1.* 642^a 23. The idea is that a composite whole is more than the sum or aggregate of its component elements. ἐπανθέω = 'supervene' also in 136. 235. 100: for ' . . . male deities *should not* also participate . . .' read perhaps rather ' . . . do not'. 115: καὶ ἀεὶ τὸ γιγνόμενον χείρο, Westerink: ' . . . and the product is always inferior' (Westerink). Product? Perhaps better: ' . . . that which is in the process of becoming . . . '. 163 . . . ἀλλὰ πρώτως γίθετο τοῦ ηδονῶς, ' . . . but in the first instance a perception of what causes the pleasure' (Westerink). I suspect here both the text and the translation. Read ἀλλὰ πρώτως γίθετο τοῦ ηδονῶς and translate: ' . . . but first comes an experience of something that gives pleasure, then the memory of that experience . . . '. 169: ἀσυμέτρω, not 'disproportionate' but 'incommensurable' [i.e. irrational] (contrasted immediately with μετρηθείσας . . . τῷ λόγῳ). 215: ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ κίνησιν ηδονῆς, not, as Westerink, 'of the changing pleasure', but rather 'of the pleasure attendant upon change (or movement)'. 225: ἀνυπόθετος (contrasted with ἐξ ὑποθέσεως), 'unconditioned' (Westerink) is not a very felicitous translation here. Translate: 'it either is or is not based on an assumption'.

THE LOEB PLUTARCH

PHILLIP H. DELACY and BENEDICT EINARSON: Plutarch's *Moralia*. Vol. vii. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvi+618. London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 18s. net.

THIS volume brings together a varied set of writings, including some of the best of Plutarch's work. *De Sera Numinis Vindicta* is a fine, well-arranged, and well-considered piece of theological writing, ending with a myth of which the ingenious detail testifies to the author's imagination, although by not leaving enough to the reader's it may fall short of the effect of its Platonic forerunners; *De Genio Socratis* is an ambitious attempt to combine philosophic discourse with history or historical novel; of the shorter pieces *De Vitioso Pudore* (here translated *On Compliancy*) is a favourable example of his moralizing, and *Consolatio ad Uxorem* is interesting not only as a social document but also to show how he can turn conventional *topoi* into something personal and sincere.

To deal with all this a new pair of scholars join the company of editors of the Loeb *Moralia*. They show themselves fully equal to their task, and the volume reaches a very high standard in every respect. They have enjoyed the good fortune of having scope for more annotation than was given (or at least taken) in some of the earlier volumes of this series. It is to be hoped that scholars who have occasion to refer to Plutarch will realize that they will find here not only a considerable commentary, but also an apparatus which importantly supplements, without quite superseding, the Teubner edition of Pohlenz and Sieveking. Professors Einarson and DeLacy have collated all manuscripts known to them, and publish here their records of those that cannot be discarded. Corrections of the Teubner record are not infrequent, and they have used some neglected manuscripts, of which the most rewarding seems to be L (Laur. 69. 13) for *Consolatio ad Uxorem*. It is unfortunate that they have not been able to give in their prefaces even a summary account of the worth and relations of the manuscripts they use; the reader must refer to their articles in *Classical Philology*, xlvi (1951) and liii (1958).

The text they establish contains fewer pitfalls than that of the Teubner, through the elimination of many unnecessary conjectures. Thus Hannibal is now allowed to say to Antiochus, alarmed at the appearance of the entrails at a sacrifice: *οὐ τὶ κρέας λέγει ποιέις, οὐ τί νοῦν ἔχων ἀνθρώπος* (606 c), for his Greek was not that of Attica. Sometimes the conjectures are Byzantine, but the editors are able to rehabilitate what the oldest manuscripts preserve. Thus at 526 c (= Euripides fr. 976) they give *ἀκόλαστ' ἀμελίᾳ* (ἀμελεῖαι G ὁμιλεῖν edd. from Diogenes Laertius) *γίνεται δούλων τέκνα*, and at 526 d *καὶ διδασκάλια* (*καὶ διδασκαλία* W *εἴα J²* *τῆς διδασκαλίας* edd. with all other manuscripts). The best of this sort is at 566 d, where the tradition is *τὸ τῆς φυχῆς ἐπίγυνον*, but a late conjecture *ἐπίγυνον* has become established; the 'cable' is now explained as attaching the soul to its body, where it has left an anchor (564 c). Einarson and DeLacy quote two further instances of the same image, and plausibly introduce yet another by conjecturing *ἀπὸ θάμνης* for the unintelligible *ὑπὸ σύριγγος* at 568 a. Although conservative, they are not obscurantist editors, and admit (excluding supplements for lacunae and slight adjustments of earlier emendations) about forty new conjectures to their text, the majority of which are certain or probable.

Each work in the volume is preceded by an excellent introduction, containing a summary, references to modern literature, and a list of previous translations. The notes at the foot of each page show a wide knowledge; there are copious references for comparison, and one may particularly welcome the exegetical notes on the difficult spurious essay *De Fato*, which has some importance for the historian of Greek philosophy, and on the astronomical aspects of the myth in *De Genio*. The translation is accurate, and in spite of keeping close to the Greek form contrives for the most part to be readable English; the myths are particularly well managed. It must, however, be confessed that there are some passages where the translators have not succeeded in reconciling the desire to provide a 'crib' with the genius of modern English. It is impossible to preserve the structure of some of Plutarch's involved sentences and at the same time to be natural. There are places, too, where they succumb to the temptation to keep Greek order at the expense of an unlovely, although possible, inversion, e.g. 'Now to Bocchoris the Egyptian, a man unnaturally cruel, Isis (they say) sent the asp' or 'since towards one who praises himself the generality of men feel a great hostility and resentment'. In the last phrase 'resentment and hostility' or 'hostility or resentment' would have been preferable. When pairing words with *kai* Plutarch often puts the stronger or more specialized first: we do this with 'or' but rarely with 'and'. Similarly 'ruined and thwarted the plans' reads oddly. But such lapses are outnumbered by the places where a felicitous phrase replaces a literal one that would have passed muster, e.g. 'not disappoint your companions' for *μή ἀπολείπειν τοὺς συνῆθεις* or 'so Greek in its old-fashioned simplicity' for *οὕτως Ἑλληνικῶς καὶ ἀφελῶς ἀρχαῖσσοντς*. A happy freedom is also employed in rendering verse quotations, e.g. for *ακληράν ἄκαρπον καὶ φύτεύεσθαι κακήν*, 'Rocky, unfit for corn or vine or tree'.

I note a few small points. 536 e, *οὗτως δὴ* should perhaps be 'at first sight' rather than 'on the following view': 548 f, *Κάπρῳ* was conjectured by Xylander (on Pausanias iv. 15. 4) before Reiske; 555 f, *ἐν χρόνῳ* is not 'at last' but 'for a long time' (with *παραμένοντα*), cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 278 d; 563 d, *κατενεχθεῖς . . . εἰς τράχηλον* not 'fallen and struck his neck' but 'fallen on his head' (for *τράχηλος* = 'head' see J. E. Powell, *C.R.* liii [1939], 58); 607 e, *φύτον ἀγενὲς* is hardly 'a base-born plant', but rather 'feeble and unproductive', cf. *Moralia* 919 c. I also hazard an explanation of the 'unexplained and possibly corrupt' *κολοφών* at 526 e, οὐ *κολοφών*, οὐ *σφαῖρα*, οὐ *τραχηλοσμός*, οὐ *Ἀκαδήμεια*, οὐ *Λύκειον*. Read ὁ *κολοφών* οὐ *σφαῖρα* κτλ. 'To cap it all, no games and no higher education.' I can adduce no parallel for such a use of ὁ *κολοφών*, but that of τὸ *πέρας* is familiar.

Trinity College, Cambridge

F. H. SANDBACH

A BOOKLOVER'S PAPYRI

B. R. REES, H. I. BELL, J. W. B. BARNS: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton*. Volume ii. Pp. xiv + 209; 46 collotype plates. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1959. Cloth, £8. 8s. net.

MR. WILFRED MERTON formed his collection of papyri in the twenties with the aim of assembling representative examples of Greek handwriting throughout

the thousand-year period within which Egypt offers specimens. Fifty texts were published in *The Merton Papyri*, Part i, in 1948 in a volume every detail of which was planned to please the eye—generous margins, fine paper, complete facsimiles in collotype. Mr. Merton did not live to see the publication of the second part, containing a further fifty texts, in a format to match the first. For its appearance we have to thank Sir Chester Beatty, who has now taken over the collection. Some thirty texts in it still await publication.

From the previous editors only the name of Sir Harold Bell remains on the title-page. Mr. C. H. Roberts has been succeeded by the Rev. Dr. John Barns and by Professor B. R. Rees. The new team makes no precise statement about the division of labour among its members, though occasional hints are dropped; they need not be pursued, for the standard of editing is high throughout. Readings are obviously trustworthy, and can be instantly checked; and an immense wealth of materials has been assembled to help interpretation. Many of the texts are incomplete and will not yield their secrets without a struggle.

As in Part i the selection ranges from the third century B.C. to the seventh century after Christ, and this wide range of date offers useful equipment to the palaeographer. Only one hand (No. 52, a fine roll of the *Odyssey*) has any claim to be considered calligraphic. The documentary hands range from the workaday to the downright laboured (among which I should class nos. 71 and 80, over-enthusiastically praised by their editors). Two texts are republications, a third is found to be the beginning of a contract in Florence. There is one scrap (51) of early Christian writing, and literary pieces are few and ordinary (two Homers, one schoolboy's *Phoenissae*). 55 is described as an 'Etymological Fragment', and the possibility of Lysimachides as author is canvassed; but the piece looks more like a commentary or *ἐπόμημα* on an author in which Lysimachides is quoted.

The rest of the texts are documents. There are ten private letters, some of such illiteracy that one despairs of penetrating the authors' meaning. All contribute something to illuminate Graeco-Egyptian life. One (62) refers to an official in A.D. 6 as 'strategus and gymnasarch'; another (63) speaks in A.D. 57 of the 'contributions for the sanctuary of Souchos being asked from everyone, Romans and Alexandrians and settlers in the Arsinoite nome'. A woman (81) warns her son if he goes to Rome 'to be on your guard against those with whom you eat and drink'. Another correspondent (85) is given advice regarding a search in the official archives, yet another (79) asks for leather straps to harness the horses to the *sakiyah* (should one not interpret *μηχανᾶ* in l. 3?). In 80 a father is told his presence is urgent (*ἀνέλθόντων* l. 2 is a far from adequate basis for the inference that he is in Alexandria, for he need only be down river from the writer, and *ἐπελήγησε* does not absolutely require that he is in trouble. In l. 5 write *xpl(a)*). In 82. 16 *ρ[α]σω* would be a better supplement than the one printed.

Ten of the documents are of small compass; ten more are good examples of their kind (note 67 depositum, 68 lease, 70 account of tax on natron, 75 request to open a will, 84 notification of death). In 76 Σαραπίων δ καὶ Απολλάνιος and his circle probably belong to the well-known Oxyrhynchus family discussed in *J.E.A.* 1952, p. 88. In 78 what is taken as *vios* at the start of l. 2 might be genitive of a name like *[Πανέδβ]υος*, a correction which would allow the whole beginning of the document to be regularized. It is a little surprising

in ll
been
seen
and
Isid
P. C
as 'I
Doe
N
befor
(a) e
npān
the p
arise
as a
as un
of th
is no
its so
all th
trace
(whi
Unive
E. I
Teub
II. G
THE
edito
editio
this f
about
can I
Wisse
nomi
use o
four
secou
his 2
mont
He w
thought
work
trans
Rudin
489

in ll. 11 and 15 to meet the second person pronoun: has more of the beginning been lost, or should l. 5 be restored [*παρὰ σοῦ name*]? In any case the loss there seems more than six letters. High place in importance must go to the four long and important texts (88–89, 91–2) from the archive of that sea-lawyer Aurelius Isidorus, carefully and fully edited. The other copies of 91 are now published as P. Cair. Isidore 74. I note that the Merton editors translate ἀνεχώρησα (l. 15) as 'I retired from the case', while Youtie and Boak render 'I took to flight'. Does it not mean simply 'I came away'?

No. 59 is an interesting series of transactions of the second century B.C. before the chrematistae, for dissolution of a marriage contract. The order is (a) enclosure of a signed decision (*ὑπογραφή*) of the chrematistae to the *ξενικῶν πράκτων*; (b) statement by the chrematistae of receipt of a *synchoreis* made by the parties (in l. 7 restore [*ἀναγ.]ορευθέσσης*); (c) the *synchoreis* itself. A difficulty arises in restoring the opening lines of (c), which are construed by the editors as a request to the chrematistae to take a certain line of action. They rule out as unsatisfactory the suggestion that these lines summarize a previous decision of the chrematistae. Their solution is even more unsatisfactory since (1) this is not a letter but a *synchoreis* document, the matter of the agreement being its sole proper content; since the *συγχωροῦμεν* clause does not begin till l. 15, all that goes before it must be factual preamble; (2) linguistically there is no trace of a verb of requesting, and the perfect passive infinitive *ἀπολελύθαι* (which must refer to action taken, not expected) rules out that there should be.

University College, London

E. G. TURNER

PAULUS ALEXANDRINUS

E. BOER: *Pauli Alexandrini Εἰσαγωγικά*. (Scr. Gr. et Rom. Bibl. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxvi+181. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958. Cloth, DM. 11. 60.

The *Rudiments of Astrology* by Paulus Alexandrinus has been once previously edited—by Andrew Schato at Wittenberg in 1586, with a second, corrected edition in 1588. Nothing is known of Schato beyond the fact that he produced this first edition, with a Latin translation, and not a great deal more is known about Paulus other than what can be gathered from his surviving work. What can be gleaned was admirably put together by Wilhelm Gundel for Pauly-Wissowa. He was reasonably called Alexandrinus because many of his astronomical data fit the latitude of Alexandria only; and this is supported by his use of the Diocletian era for dating, the Egyptian names of the months, and the four-year Egyptian period with an intercalary day. That he flourished in the second half of the fourth century of the Christian era is a fair deduction from his 20th chapter, where to illustrate his argument he uses the 20th day of the month Mecheir in the 94th year of the Diocletian era, i.e. 20 February 378. He was not a Christian, for he believed the planets to be the abode of gods, though the manuscripts have often been modified in a Christian sense. The works to which he refers, and his employment of unusual forms, including transliterations of Latin words, show that he was a well-read man. His *Rudiments* must have won immediate acceptance, for it was the subject of

a commentary by Heliodorus, brother of Ammonius, who made observations at Alexandria between 498 and 509.

The task of making a critical edition of this work was begun by Pierre Bourdreaux, but after collating two of the Paris manuscripts he lost his life in the First World War. Wilhelm Gundel collated a further eight manuscripts, but was unable to bring the work to completion. Their results were passed by J. G. Gundel to Dr. Emilie Boer, who has finished the task with the thoroughness and clear-sighted scholarship that she has already displayed in editing two of the minor works of Ptolemy, also for the Teubner series. It must have been a task of exceptional difficulty, for the text of Paulus has been sadly mutilated by omissions, additions, and alterations, and no praise is too high for the success of Dr. Boer in establishing a definitive text and supporting it with a careful critical apparatus and a brilliant Latin survey of the manuscripts and succinct references to all the relevant modern literature. The 37 chapters into which she thinks the text should be divided—this has always been a matter of some uncertainty—are followed by 100 scholia. The whole is rounded off by an appendix in which Professor O. Neugebauer gives a valuable series of interpretations of astronomical passages.

The difference between the text of Paulus as it left the hands of Schato and as it now leaves those of Dr. Boer is partly explained by the fact that the former relied on a single manuscript whereas the latter has had occasion to refer to some forty-eight. Of these, ten contain the work in full, two formerly contained it in full but now have pages missing, two have the beginning of the work only, one has several chapters sometimes abbreviated and sometimes in full, and thirty-two contain chapters from Paulus, in full or abbreviated, interspersed in other works. Valuable preliminary studies in the manuscripts have already been made in the twelve published volumes of the *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*.

In the view of Dr. Boer, all the manuscripts are derived from a single archetype already defective, although they differ in the titling both of the work and of the chapters and in the number and arrangement of the chapters. Errors of scribes, e.g. διλούσης for δδούσης and ἀπαντός ἔλας for ἀπαν τὸ σέλας, show that it was written in majuscules and without separation of words. The most useful manuscript is Z (Parisinus Gr. 2506), written at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Valuable help is given by Y (Parisinus Gr. 2425), although incomplete and written in the fifteenth century, for it is derived from an older source; in it is found the summary of the whole work prefixed by Dr. Boer to her edition. The oldest manuscript containing any part of the text of Paulus is L (Laurentianus Gr. 28), which comes from the eleventh or possibly tenth century. The manuscript used by Schato came from the library of Heinrich Rantzau, and was probably destroyed by the soldiers of Wallenstein; the class to which it belongs is only moderately helpful for the recension. The text opens with a reference to a previous edition, but of this no trace has survived.

The work is a synopsis of ancient astrology and covers much the same ground as Ptolemy's *Ἀποτελεσματικά*. It opens with a summary of the properties of the twelve signs of the Zodiac, explains the terms and techniques used by astrologers, and leads on to horoscopes and climacterics. The line between astrology and astronomy being somewhat arbitrary in ancient days, there is a good deal of what we should call elementary astronomy. The final chapter of the text as printed, 'On the Origin of the World', differs in language and character from

the rest, and it is doubtful if it is the work of Paulus; possibly it was taken from an Arabic work, translated into Greek, and eventually tacked on to the genuine text.

IVOR BULMER-THOMAS

THE LOEB AELIAN

Aelian, *On Animals*, Vol. ii (Books vi-xi). Translated by A. F. SCHOLFIELD. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 413. London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 15s. net.

VOL. I, containing books i-v, was reviewed in *C.R.* lxxiii (1959), 247-9. The present volume has the excellent qualities of its predecessor. As before, the translation is neat and lively; and questionable renderings are extremely rare. One occurs in ix. 8, where the mother elephant hurls herself 'head first upon her child', and not 'upon the head of her child'. Hence, later in the passage, Gow's *κατὰ κεφαλὴν ἀξάσα* which merely repeats the idea, is doubtful (*τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀξάσα* MSS.). Possibly the mother elephant died *τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀναράξασα*. In xi. 6 *ἴδια ἀγαθά* should mean 'peculiar assets' rather than 'private property' (cf. xi. 31, beginning). In xi. 27, why is 'Moesia' put for '*Πλλυρίους*' when it makes the Illyrians so remote from Epirus?

Only a few of the many helpful notes seem doubtful: viii. 24 the *agreus* may well be the Indian Mynah, but anyone who has tried to compete with a mynah in conversation will wonder why Aelian says that the bird is dumb in captivity; ix. 20 the 'Thracian stone' is lignite rather than quicklime, and the river Pontus in which it is found is not the Strymon (Struma), but a tributary, the Strumitz; xi. 34 the *muraena* that sucked poison from a man's hand is more likely to have been a lamprey than a moray.

Aelian's text, riddled as it is with corrupt passages and packed with interpolations, provides ample scope for reckless emendation. Fortunately the editor has not been tempted in this direction. A few new readings are proposed. In vi. 63 Gow's *παρ' ὄσον* for *πᾶν ὄσον* is skilful and convincing. Less happy is ix. 15, where Post's conjecture *ὄν περ<σει>σασιν ἀπόκριμα αὐτοῖς* (for *ὄνπερ σασιν ἀπόκριμα αὐτοῖς*) is ingenious, but puzzling. Is *ὄν* a misprint for *οὐ*, and can *ἐστίν* be naturally understood in this relative clause? *ὄνπερ σασιν ἀπόκριναι αὐτοῖς* is perhaps too plausible to be worth suggesting.

Praiseworthy though the editor's self-restraint may be, there are passages in which his treatment of the text appears to be over-cautious: vii. 6 *ὑποτέμνονται τὰς ὁδοὺς τὸν διώκοντας* is translated 'baffle the pursuers by the course they take', but the sense and the construction are unusual: possibly *ὑποτέμνονται τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῖς διώκονται*, 'prevent the pursuers from advancing'; ix. 17 *τὸ γύρον τοις οτεγανὸν μέρος <πρὸς> τὸ ὑδωρ τὸ ἐμπίπτον ἀκεῖται αὐθὶς* cancels the lacuna printed after *ἐμπίπτον*, and we no longer have to make *ἐμπίπτον* govern an accusative; ix. 30 Hercher's conjecture *ἐμποδίζει τοὺς θηρατάς* for *ἀφανίζει τοὺς θηρατάς* deserves to be considered or at any rate quoted.

A possible clue to vii. 9 *τόμολογεῖσθαι δὲ τὴν ἄλλων μέν, ἐκ τούτων δὲ ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον†* is given by *ὅμολογεῖ . . . ἵέρακες*, nine lines below. If we read *ὅμολογεῖται δὲ τὴν ἄλλων μέν, κτλ.*, and place the phrase after *ἵέρακες*, we have the sequence: 'So the aforesaid difference of foods concedes the point that hawks know what is appropriate and agreeable to each age. The point is conceded on

other grounds, but more particularly on this evidence.' If this suggestion is right, διολογεῖσθαι . . . μᾶλλον is a corrupt and misplaced interpolation, the remedy for which is unfortunately only of theoretic interest.

In general, there is little to criticize in this second volume, and we look forward to the third. Misprints are rare. I have noticed δικτύος (p. 178, for δικτύοις); ἐμπίπτον (p. 238); τῆς τοῦ πωλεύσαντος (p. 378, for τὴν τ. π.); a stop omitted after δεῦρο (p. 378); and διατειλμένης (p. 384, for διατειλμένη).

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

THE Σύμμικτα Ζητήματα OF PORPHYRIUS

HEINRICH DÖRRIE: Porphyrios' Σύμμικτα Ζητήματα. Ihre Stellung in System und Geschichte des Neuplatonismus nebst einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten. (Zetemata, Heft 20.) Pp. xiii + 236. Munich: Beck, 1959. Paper, DM 22.50.

THE only adverse criticism of any substance which the present reviewer can find to bring against Professor Dörrie's book is that the title does not give an adequate idea of the richness of the contribution which it makes to our understanding of Middle Platonist and Neoplatonist thought about the soul. The author can hardly be blamed for this, however, for the greater part of the book is in fact occupied by a very careful and sober investigation of Porphyry's σύμμικτα ζητήματα, of what the title implied, of what the work probably contained, and of the direct quotations from it and information about it which can be discovered in Nemesius *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*. But it is the duty of the reviewer to point out that Dörrie not only tries to discover what was in the σύμμικτα ζητήματα, which, as he shows convincingly, were a series of treatises concerned with the soul, but, in his comment on and discussion of what he has discovered, and especially in his concluding chapter, entitled 'Auswertung und Einordnung', gives a very illuminating account, certainly the best so far available, of Porphyry's distinctive doctrine of soul, and of the discussions within the Platonist school before Plotinus, and the controversies between Platonists, Stoics, and Peripatetics which prepared the way for it.

In carrying his discovery of Porphyrian material in Nemesius beyond the passage in ch. 3 already established as from the σύμμικτα ζητήματα by H. von Arnim Dörrie proceeds with great caution and soundness of judgement and his conclusions are convincing. A very good feature of his method is that he shows an interest not only in Porphyry but in Nemesius himself, and takes the trouble to inquire why and how the Christian theologian finds the pagan philosopher useful for his own purposes (cf., for example, pp. 127-9). The amount we know about Porphyry's work when Dörrie has finished remains limited, but we can feel some confidence that we really do know it, and it is enough to make a good deal clearer a fact of some importance for our understanding of later Platonist thought about the nature of man (and its relationship to Christian thought). This is that Plotinus and Porphyry, who on this point, as Dörrie rightly observes, sharpened and exaggerated the teaching of his master, stand apart from the rest of the Platonic tradition in their insistence on the transcendence and impassibility of the soul, which is unaffected by its presence in the body, and belongs wholly to the transcendent, intelligible

world (on this point in particular Porphyry's thought seems to have been without the nuances and precisions which are sometimes to be found in Plotinus). This doctrine is not Middle Platonist (the history of the developments which led up to it is admirably set out by Dörrie in his last chapter) and was explicitly repudiated (as he also demonstrates) by Iamblichus and the Neoplatonists who followed him. It carries with it a body-soul dualism of a peculiar sharpness which should not be attributed to Platonism, or even Neoplatonism, as a whole; and it provides a good criterion for distinguishing the influence of Plotinus or Porphyry from that of Middle Platonism or later Neoplatonism.

Besides this, Dörrie makes a number of other important contributions to our understanding of later Greek thought about the nature of man. He has some very interesting remarks about the survival in Middle Platonist polemic of the technique of destructive criticism developed by the Sceptical Academy (pp. 121-3); and a particularly valuable feature of his treatment of the pre-Plotinian controversies is the clearness with which he brings out the Peripatetic contribution to them and the limits of the agreement and extent of the disagreement between Platonists and Peripatetics about the nature of the soul. The three-cornered arguments between Platonists, Peripatetics, and Stoics which contributed so much to the formation of the thought of Plotinus have never been better described.

The book is well and not too cumbersomely indexed. The text and commentary of the Porphyrian fragments is integrated with the rest of the book in a way which improves its unity but makes reference to any particular fragment rather more difficult than it need be.

University of Liverpool

A. H. ARMSTRONG

PLOTINUS

PAUL HENRY, HANS-RUDOLF SCHWYZER: *Plotini Opera*, ii. Pp. liii+501. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959. Cloth, 450 B. fr.

The second volume of Henry and Schwyzler's edition of Plotinus contains, besides the text of *Enneads* iv and v and an important preface, an interesting and unusual feature. This is a complete English translation, by the distinguished Arabic scholar Geoffrey Lewis, of all known Arabic translations or paraphrases of Plotinus. These *Arabica* and the manuscripts on which the translation is based are described in the Preface (pp. xxvi-xxxiv) and the editors clearly and sensibly explain the reasons which led them to print the translations (pp. xxxiv-xxxvi). They have abandoned, for good reasons, the view once held by Henry that the *Arabica*, or at least the *Theologia Aristotelis*, are derived from the scholia of Amelius of which Porphyry speaks in the *Life* (3. 46), and now incline to think that they are all based on Porphyry's edition, the *Enneads*. Consequently they have some usefulness, though a very limited one (as the editors make clear) for the correction or defence of the manuscript text. And they are of the greatest interest to anyone who is concerned with the survival and development of Greek philosophical ideas in the Islamic world. One section of the *Theologia* is of particular interest. This is the second, of which the author is said in the Arabic text to be Porphyry, and which consists of a series of *argumenta* or subject-headings to the first thirty-four chapters of iv. 4. The editors suspect that we may have here a translation of a small part of the *κεφάλαια* which Porphyry

says he composed for his edition (*Life* 26, 36–37) and it seems quite likely that they are right. If so, this section is obviously of the greatest value and interest to Plotinian scholars, and clearly deserves its place in the critical edition, even if in general it does not seem quite beyond doubt that the arguments put forward so moderately and reasonably by the editors justify the rather cumbersome expedient of printing an English translation of the *Arabica* opposite (more or less) the Greek text to which it is relevant. (It is of course obvious that to print a critical *Arabic* text would have been an impossibly difficult and expensive undertaking.) In the preparation of the Greek critical text the editors have continued on the same lines as in the first volume. It is, that is to say, a 'conservative' text which very seldom departs from the carefully assessed evidence of the manuscript, admirably presented in the elaborate apparatus. In the very important first section of the preface to the present volume, entitled 'Quid antiquae editiones doceant', the editors show, at length and convincingly, that the evidence of the Plotinus quotations in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica* and of Porphyry's *Sententiae ad intellegibilia ducentes* supports their confidence in the manuscript tradition. They maintain their view that the Eusebius quotations were taken from the edition of Eustochius, not from that of Porphyry, and that therefore, when they agree with the text of the *Enneads*, 'semper fere Plotini ipsius verba audimus' (p. x). But, as they point out, even if this is denied, as it is by Theiler, Harder, and Dodds, and the Eusebius quotations are supposed to have been taken from Porphyry's edition, their value for confirming the original text of that edition remains very great, as Eusebius wrote the *Praeparatio Evangelica* not many years after the publication of the *Enneads*, and it appears that the manuscripts of Eusebius have never been corrected from the *Enneads* or those of the *Enneads* from Eusebius. As the editors pleasantly put it, 'Nobis scribarum et pietas et pinguis animus magno commodo est'.

The present reviewer has for some time been translating the Henry-Schwyzer text of Plotinus and is therefore in a fairly good position to judge at least whether on the whole it makes sense and a sense which can reasonably be attributed to Plotinus: and his experience has been that on the whole it does. There are of course places where a conservative reliance on the manuscript tradition has been carried too far and has resulted in the printing of impossible, or highly improbable, readings: in a number of cases the editors are now ready to admit this, as the *editio minor* will show. But these places are comparatively few, and the editors, judged by the test of translation, seem to be right far more often than not in their rejection of the emendations of their predecessors and their reliance on the manuscript tradition.

University of Liverpool

A. H. ARMSTRONG

*QVID IVVAT EXTINCTOS FERRVM
DEMITTERE IN ARTVS?*

Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano, Sulmona, Maggio 1958. 2 vols. Pp. 289, 420; 20 plates. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1959. Paper, L. 5,000.

In May 1958 fifty-two scholars from twelve countries assembled in Sulmona to commemorate the two-thousandth anniversary of Ovid's birth. Forty-three

communications were delivered and are printed here, 'ut prodantur doctorum memoriae virorum' (Paratore, i. 12). The wisdom of such a proceeding may be questioned. Obviously a reviewer must leave out of account those contributions which are frankly and admirably ἀγωνίσματα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα (as a model of this kind see Enk's 'Disputatio de Ovidii "Epistulis ex Ponto"' (i. 205 ff.), couched in fluent and easy Latin), and which it would be uncandid to criticize as if they had higher pretensions. But if we set these aside, the number of those remaining which materially advance our knowledge of Ovid and aid our appreciation of his poetry is not large; and there are one or two which for the good of their authors might well have been tactfully suppressed.

Subjects and treatments are too diverse to permit of easy generalization, but one or two trends may be remarked. Ovid's exile is a favourite theme, and here, as usual, 'the fashionable art of hariolation' (an admirable phrase, for which I thank Professor Maguinness, *C.R.*, n.s. vii [1957], 125) comes to the rescue of our ignorance. To Herescu Ovid's Getic poem was, consonantly with his whole life, a 'geste de défi' against the Augustan régime (i. 76), while Lozovan (ii. 368) conjectures that in composing it 'il voulait peut-être entraîner les Tomitains à un acte d'allégeance envers Rome'. The fact is that we do not know why Ovid wrote the poem: what is the good of guessing about it? The poem's lost, and there's an end on't. Divination must play some part in literary history, but there are limits. This, then, is one trend, exemplified also by other papers (e.g. Grisart, 'La publication des "Métamorphoses": une source du récit d'Ovide', ii. 125 ff.: the main thesis briefly noticed by Wilkinson, p. 238, as well as by Birt and Peeters; all else a tissue of hypotheses), the indagation of the unverifiable. Another is the creation and triumphant solution of 'non-problems' (to borrow from Mr. Kingsley Amis this time). A good example is to be seen in Paratore's interminable essay (i. 173 ff.: 'L'evoluzione della "sphragis" dalle prime alle ultime opere di Ovidio'). When I say that this is even worse than Copley on the *paraclausithyon* I intend no scurrility; I beg to be understood literally. Counsel is seriously darkened by the irresponsible use of spurious or semi-spurious technical terms like *σφραγίς*, *paraclausithyon*, *epyllion*, *σπουδογέλοιον*, as if they were part of the regular stock-in-trade of ancient critics and as if ancient poets were conscious of the categories they imply. It is hence a piece of impertinence to speak of *Tristia* iv. 10 on such premisses as a 'caotico intreccio di motivi e di scopi' (Paratore, 197). It is difficult to believe that this was written by the same man who threw off in discussion the stimulating and illuminating remark: 'La maggior gloria di Ovidio sta nell'aver staccato il mondo della latinità della *gravitas* della letteratura precedente' (ii. 375). However, Grisart (203) 'loda P. per aver scelto un argomento vergine', so no doubt we shall be hearing much more of it. Such exegesis as this conduces to tendentiousness: an example which would be sinister if it were not comic is to be seen in Bilinski's 'Elementi esiodei nelle "Metamorfosi" di Ovidio' (ii. 101 ff.), in which it is shown that scholarship and politics do not mix.

It would be wearisome to multiply examples of the other faults which mar these discussions, of the woolliness of thought, the rhapsodizing, the word-spinning, and (in at least one case) the pure lunacy. (The audiences seem to have been remarkably long-suffering, to judge from the 'Interventi'; but conferences which use five official languages—or six, since the language of Seel's contribution cannot be called Latin—must suffer from a certain costiveness in

discussion.) Instead, at the risk of seeming invidious, I will single out what appear to me to be particularly rewarding contributions, premising that I am not necessarily condemning those that I fail to mention. (It is noteworthy that some of the best of these concern Ovid's *Nachleben*, a comparatively unworked field, where in order to be original it is not necessary to be fantastic.) Campana, 'Le statue quattrocentesche di Ovidio e il capitano salomonese di Polidoro Tiberti' (i. 269 ff.: interesting and scholarly); Richmond, 'On imitation in Ovid's "Ibis" and the "Halieutica" ascribed to him' (ii. 9 ff.: a perceptive and original discussion of a well-worn topic); Ussani, 'Appunti sulla fortuna di Ovidio nel Medioevo' (ii. 159 ff.: Trebet's use of Ovid for his commentary on Seneca's tragedies); D'Elia, 'Lineamenti dell'evoluzione stilistica e ritmica nelle opere ovidiane' (ii. 377 ff.: the main thesis is unacceptable, but the argument reveals great critical acumen).

Finally a word on what I, at any rate, consider a grave matter. Illuminati has contributed (ii. 311 ff.) three sets of Latin verses, admirable in intention, detestable in execution; and the editorial committee of five, headed by Paratore, editing with more than Alexandrian rigidity and respect for the *παράδοσις* ('religiosissime', i. 12), have done nothing to make them better. Surely one of the five must know that *quietem* is not an anapaest? It must be said with all imaginable emphasis that it is scandalous to disfigure with such stuff a book which is intended as a tribute to the memory of Ovid—Ovid, of all poets! *Quid dicam non inuenio: omnia infra indignationem uerba sunt.*

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

THE LATIN LOVE ELEGY

GEORG LUCK: *The Latin Love Elegy*. Pp. 182. London: Methuen, 1959. Cloth 22s. 6d. net.

THE genre discussed in this book is an extraordinary phenomenon: represented by only four¹ poets of note, it flourished for a bare half-century and died without posterity—killed, as Luck remarks (p. 38), by Ovid, who destroyed the mystery which was its essence. Little less extraordinary is the neglect of the genre as a whole by modern scholars; though it is only just to ascribe it, at any rate in part, to a prudent recognition of the formidable difficulties of the subject. To deal adequately with the Latin elegists calls for an exceptional combination of qualities, and Luck's attractive little book shows clearly that he possesses some of the most important: perception, sensitivity, tact, imagination, a sense of humour. As a first essay it reflects great credit on its author. His claims for it are modest, and I sympathize with his fear that the poems as works of art may be smothered by a ponderous philological investigation and with his insistence that such books as this do not absolve the reader from studying the texts for himself. Nevertheless it may be regretted that his treatment was not in some respects more ample. The following remarks are offered in the hope of a second enlarged and improved edition.

Paramount should be the needs of the student, by which I mean the serious seeker after knowledge and enlightenment. Luck's laudable desire for brevity

¹ Luck is commendably cautious about Gallus (p. 46); more stress might be laid on the fact that Quintilian brigaded him, and no

other elegist, with Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

and excusable reluctance to embroil his argument in polemic leads him occasionally to treat controversial topics as if no controversy existed. An ignorant but alert reader will quickly notice that the addressee of Catullus 68 in Luck's translation (pp. 50 ff.) is now Manius, now Allius: a short note would dispel bewilderment, and since a not unimportant consequence is drawn from the unity of the poem,¹ it is an elementary duty to admit that this unity has been impugned. At p. 145 it is casually remarked that the three-book edition of the *Amores* 'includes fifty elegies; fifteen each in Books I and III, twenty in Book II'. What will the conscientious reader unversed in the textual and editorial history of the *Amores* make of this? Yet the statement is perfectly correct, and a short note would make all plain. These two examples are perhaps of no great moment; another verges on irresponsibility. Chapter 2, 'The Origin of the Elegy as a Literary Form', begins with an analysis of the elegiac couplet of which it is difficult to write with moderation. Stress is not differentiated from ictus; syllables are confused with feet; the couplet is said to fall into three parts, 'a waltzing rhythm', echoing 'the structure of the dactyl: long-short-short';² the internal rhymes at *Am.* iii. 9. 21–24 'seem to convey the sound of luxuriant, half-oriental dirges'. What then do they convey at, for example, *A.A.* ii. 193–6? A clean sweep should be made of this mixture of fact and fancy (including the misleading 'flute').

The analyses of selected poems and passages which support the argument of the main chapters demonstrate both the strength and weakness of Luck's approach. They abound in acute judgements, just reflections, and striking hints; but they are uneven in design and execution. Formal and linguistic questions receive too little attention. The arrangement and composition of the *Monobiblos* might well be discussed in the light of the principles briefly noticed apropos of Tibullus (pp. 66 f.). A disconnected and fragmentary picture of Propertius' art is all that emerges from the series of passages lifted from their context to illustrate this or that trait in the poet's character. The analyses of Tibullus i. 7 and i. 4 (pp. 76 ff.) are among the best things in the book, but their aim is partial (to illustrate Alexandrian themes) and corners are cut, as elsewhere, in the exposition. It is impossible to exaggerate the exemplary value for the student of a complete and detailed analysis, formal, thematic, stylistic, linguistic, of a literary work of art: in the case of elegy it is particularly important to identify as many as possible of the sources on which the poet drew,³ for only so can the reader become fully aware of the interplay of experience and myth, reality and literary convention, creation and borrowing, which makes the genre so difficult, even repellent, to many students. Propertius in particular is *φωνάεις οὐνέτοις*.

A good deal more might be said about the implications of the couplet form, particularly important for Ovid. His early rhetorical training, of which Luck says little, was clearly not without its effect; but it was the challenge presented by language and metre which really called forth and to some extent (in the elegies) perverted his powers. A proper account of this subject has yet to be written: Axelson's stimulating paper in *Ovidiana* (pp. 121 ff.) points the way.

¹ '... what really matters is the fact that [different elements] all occur in the same poem ...' (p. 57).

² Ovid's own words at *Am.* i. 1. 27 *sex mihi surget opus numeris, in quinque residat*

show that for him the couplet consisted of two parts. The onus is on a modern writer to prove otherwise.

³ Not neglecting comedy, though I agree, broadly, with Luck's argument at pp. 35 ff.

Ovid indeed is skimpily treated here, since what some would consider his most successful love-poetry, the double *Heroides*, hardly receives a mention. *Am.* i. 5, on the other hand, is discussed (pp. 152 ff.) at a length hardly commensurate with its merits.

A few modifications of detail may be suggested. Are we sure that 'Valerius Cato wrote the *Lydia*' (p. 43)? What is the 'give and take of Roman religion' (p. 60)? Do we know that Ovid had 'numerous love-affairs' (p. 158)? The short bibliography displays a certain caprice. To write that the commentaries of Heinsius (in admiration of whom I yield to no one) and Burman 'are not yet replaced' seems odd; readers in search of illustrative parallels could do worse than consult Brandt's *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, which despite their admittedly great deficiencies are full of instruction. I am sorry not to find K. F. Smith's Tibullus mentioned, and it seems a pity not to call the attention of students to Rand's delightful *Ovid* (cf. his remarks on the double *Heroides*, especially p. 32). Luck's English is in general excellent: 'slippery' (p. 144) for 'lubricious' is no longer current coin and 'circumscribes' (p. 155) recalls Mr. Weller.

I have enjoyed reading this book and have, I think, learned from it. If I have here dwelt mainly on its shortcomings, it is because they may, if uncorrected, eclipse its excellences, which are numerous and real.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR

C. Iulii Caesaris *Commentarii de Bello Civili*. Erklärt von F. KRANER-F. HOFMANN-H. MEUSEL. 12 Auflage. Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge von HANS OPPERMANN. Pp. xvi+425; 5 maps. Berlin: Weidmann, 1959. Cloth, DM 33.

THIS reprint of Meusel's edition of the *Bellum Civile*, an edition published more than fifty years ago and still unrivalled as a historical commentary on Caesar, is supplemented by a survey of recent Caesarian studies compiled by Dr. Hans Oppermann.

Introducing his survey, which starts from Kalinka's last *Forschungsbericht* (Bursian, 1939) or, more exactly, from his own book *Caesar, der Schriftsteller und sein Werk* (Leipzig, 1933), Oppermann disarms criticism by renouncing any claim to completeness, and insisting that the risk of including unimportant articles must be taken. For the most part his judgement is sound. He does, however, venture to mention some reviews, and here his choice is sometimes surprising, as when he includes Fabre's review of Barwick (*Caesars Bellum Civile, Tendenz, Abfassungszeit und Stil*, Leipzig, 1951) in *Latomus* xi (1952), 86 ff., and omits the more substantial discussion of the same book, along with Rambaud's *L'Art de la déformation historique dans les Commentaires de César* (Paris, 1953), by Balsdon in *J.R.S.* xlv (1955), 161 ff.

Oppermann is chiefly concerned with discussions of Caesar's method and aim in writing the *Commentarii*, and with the related problems of date of composition and publication. In the book already mentioned he accepted Lucian's view of the intermediate position of the ὑπομνήμα between official records and the historian's finished work as representing Caesar's own view of the *commentarius*. This is the conclusion to be drawn from Cicero, *Brut.* 262, and Hirtius,

viii. pr. 5. Against this Bömer (*Hermes*, lxxxi [1953], 210 ff.) has insisted on the differences between the ὑπομνῆμα and the *commentarius*, on the essentially Roman character of the latter, which he takes to be an official's journal (*Amtsbuch*), and on a close connexion between the *acta diurna* of 59 B.C., Caesar's *B.G.* and *B.C.*, and the documents Caesar left behind, described by Cicero as *commentarii*. Oppermann now answers Bömer, rightly claiming (a) that Bömer's view rejects the best evidence we have (Cicero and Hirtius) of what Caesar is likely to have understood by *commentarius* in a literary connexion, and (b) that the 'Amtsbuch'-*commentarius* would be more like a file or dossier than the extant *commentarii*.

Next comes the question of Caesar's trustworthiness. To answer the most detailed and determined attack yet made on the reliability of Caesar's account, that of Rambaud (op. cit.), Oppermann relies chiefly on Collins's review of Rambaud (*Gnomon*, xxvi [1954], 527 ff.), but also on Collins's dissertation *Propaganda, Ethics and Psychological Assumptions in Caesar's Writings* (Frankfurt, 1952). The value of Collins's studies lies in his recognition that 'the most powerful propaganda is the truth', and that the adroit propagandist will avoid obvious untruths, while disguising unfavourable facts. It is difficult to see how Caesar could have hoped to deceive his contemporaries with as wilful a distortion of the facts as Rambaud believes him to have perpetrated in the *Commentarii*. And a reading of recently published accounts of events in World War II confirms the view that generals may sometimes misrepresent what happened simply through lack of knowledge or failure of memory.

Oppermann treats the question of composition and publication date more briefly. The unfinished appearance of the *B.C.* has been convincingly used by Klotz (Teubner edition, 1950) as an argument for posthumous publication, and accepted by a large number (perhaps, as Oppermann asserts, the majority) of present-day scholars. Then did Caesar write it towards the end of his life, when his supremacy was no longer challenged? Probability, as Fabre (Budé edition, 1947) has claimed, points to an earlier date for composition—before 46, or at any rate before Thapsus. These were substantially the conclusions which Meusel himself had reached in 1913.

In dealing with textual matters Opperman is not so sound. He gives a conspectus of passages where Meusel's reading differs from that of Fabre and Klotz, and includes five readings suggested by Cupaiolo (*Paideia*, ix [1954], 288 ff.). The whole conspectus bears witness to the readiness of modern scholars to admit into a text of Caesar what Meusel boldly labelled 'ganz unmöglich', and its testimony would be even more impressive if the list were more nearly complete—I counted more than seventy significant differences of reading which Oppermann has omitted to mention. Several misprints detract still further from the value of this section. (Misprints elsewhere are rare, except in the numerical references to the works discussed.)

Oppermann's survey went to the press too early to take into account the studies of Caesar published in this country and in Italy to commemorate the bimillenary of Caesar's death. (American anticipation of the event accounts for the mention of an article in a commemorative symposium in *C.W.* I [1956].) And since he wrote, several important discussions have been published, in particular by Collins on 'Caesar and the Corruption of Power' (*Historia*, iv [1955], 445 ff.), by Abel and Collins on the date of the *B.C.* (*Mus. Helv.* xv [1958], 56 ff. and *A.J.P.* lxxx [1959], 113 ff. respectively), and by Lossmann, reviewing

Barwick (*Gnomon*, xxviii [1956], 355 ff.) and discussing Suet. *Julius* 56 (*Hermes*, lxxxv [1957], 47 ff.). A new appraisal will soon be needed.

University of St. Andrews

J. H. SIMON

CICERO'S *DE LEGIBUS*

Cicéron: *Traité des Lois*. Texte établi et traduit par GEORGES DE PLINVAL. (Collection Budé.) Pp. lxxii+130 (most double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper, 8 Fr.

M. DE PLINVAL's text is inevitably based on the three Leyden manuscripts Vossianus 84 (A), Vossianus 86 (B), and Heinsianus 118 (H). He also provides a number of good readings from a fifteenth-century Ghent manuscript (Bibliothèque de l'Université, 68); some of these have hitherto been attributed to later scholars. He does not claim that these readings are anything but emendations; yet he often quotes his Ghent manuscript even when it agrees with one or more of the principal manuscripts. Sometimes he even records its nonsensical mistakes, and offers such information as 'subsicivis codd.: subcidi vis G'. This procedure wastes much space in the apparatus, and blurs the outline of the tradition.

De Plinval's reports of A B H are by no means complete, and he often prints readings without indicating that they have no authority. This method is justified in a short apparatus where trivialities are involved, but one ought to be told that such readings as the following are emendations: i. 2 *verum* (*verum verum* codd.), i. 48 *expetit* (*exprimit* codd.), i. 61 *se ipse noscet* (*si ipse nosset* codd.), ii. 57 *porcus* (*corpus* codd.). At other places the evidence is misreported, as can be seen from a glance at the published facsimiles of A and H; for instance at i. 45 A H read *quid sit est* not *quod sit est*, at i. 47 *effectunt* not *effectant*, at i. 57 *seleuci* not *saleuci* (this list could be considerably extended).

The apparatus also contains serious defects in method. At many places in A, B, and H second hands have been at work; sometimes they seem to reproduce the reading of the archetype more faithfully than the first hands, but they are by no means always superior. De Plinval repeatedly fails to distinguish the different hands, and as a result gives a misleading picture of the evidence. Again, when one reads such a note as (i. 28) 'quam tu longe H: quantum ABC' one assumes that ABG omit *longe*; but in fact A (and presumably BG) reads *quantum longe*. This misleading method is used repeatedly. The apparatus also contains a great many other blemishes.

De Plinval prints in his text more than 130 emendations, supplements, or deletions which he claims as his own. Even speculative conjectures have a place in textual criticism; but it is surely not the function of a new edition to display the editor's own ideas on such a scale. Most people find it difficult to view their own emendations with detachment, and de Plinval has clearly been thinking too much of his own score. In fact, most of his emendations are not very good. Some show a lack of feeling for prose rhythm; for instance at i. 46, where the manuscripts read *opinione essent* (*essem* in the apparatus is a misprint), he unnecessarily adopts his own *opinione essemus*. Others show a surprising unfamiliarity with Ciceronian idiom; for instance at ii. 6 he proposes *ut iam videar adduci* *<ad aestimandum>* *hanc quoque quae te procrearit esse patriam tuam*. But Cicero's use of *adduci* is illustrated by du Mesnil, whose commentary, we are

told, has 'une faible valeur philologique'. Occasionally de Plinval is too imaginative; for instance at i. 7 where the manuscripts read *multas (et) ineptus datio summam impudentiam* he proposes *multa sane apta Latino sermoni impertiens*. Of course most of his emendations are better than this, but even when they cannot be proved wrong, one usually feels that other proposals (or the manuscripts themselves) are equally good.

It appears further that at least thirty of de Plinval's emendations have been anticipated in whole or in part. (I am grateful to Mr. E. Courtney for calling my attention to this matter; he may say something himself on a future occasion.) These emendations are mainly to be found in the standard editions by Davies, Möser-Creuzer, and Bäke. Many are trivial, and could easily have occurred to more than one scholar, but a few are more spectacular. At iii. 43 Bäke and de Plinval have independently suggested *divinitus* for *definitas*. Better still, at ii. 5, where the manuscripts read *et simfrantidem et atticis*, Valckenaer (quoted by Bäke) and de Plinval have both excogitated *et sui erant demi et Attici*. In many of these places the author of the emendation has proposed it in a very tentative manner; when de Plinval writes *scripti* can he mean simply that he is the first editor to put an emendation in his text? If this is not what he means, then he has been negligent in his study of previous editions.

The translation appears to be much more successful than the text. The introduction is useful, though perhaps it does not contain anything very new. Apart from the footnotes, there are twenty pages of supplementary notes at the end of the book; some names, dates, and Greek accents are wrong. The rites of the *bona dea* were not presided over by the wife of the *pontifex maximus* as such. M. Claudius Marcellus, cos. 51 B.C., was not consul again in 49.

This edition falls short of the standards which one expects from the Budé series. Readers who do not want a translation will find it much safer to use Ziegler's text (Heidelberg, 1950).

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

R. G. M. NISBET

THE LOEB LIVY

Livy, Vol. xiv: *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*. Translated by A. C. SCHLESINGER, with a General Index to Livy by R. M. GEER. Pp. x+557; 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE Loeb Livy, which rests on the work of B. O. Foster, F. G. Moore, Evan T. Sage, and A. C. Schlesinger, has now reached completion, and we may offer congratulations on a most useful achievement. The edition presents a readable text and (in varying degrees of elegance) a translation that can be conveniently followed alongside the text. Livy is an author who benefits by being read in long stretches, if one is to appreciate the sweep of his style, and—to judge from the reprinting—many readers have welcomed the assistance of the Loeb editors.

The present volume may be of less general interest, but is particularly useful for the texts that it makes available. Dr. Schlesinger has edited and translated not only the *Periodiae* of Bks. xlvi-cxlii, along with the Oxyrhynchus *Epitome* for Bks. xxxvii-xl and xlviii-lv and the fragments of the lost books, but also Julius Obsequens's tables of prodigies from Livy as they survive for the years 190-11 B.C. This is as far as one can go in collecting the more or less direct

records of Livy's text. The work is of special interest to historians for the evidence it contains of events under the late Republic. In judging Livy, too, even if the earlier Decades were the most popular, one should at least try to gain the perspective of his whole production: on this matter see now R. Syme, *Tacitus*, pp. 138 ff. Certainly readers of Livy should not miss the Sertorius fragment (No. 18, from Bk. xci) or the obituary on Cicero (No. 50, from Bk. cxx). The general index by R. M. Geer (mainly of proper names and places) has obvious value; but note that the references are not to the Latin text of Livy but to the volumes of the Loeb translation itself.

The text of the *Periochae*, the Oxyrhynchus *Epitome*, and *Obsequens* is based upon Rossbach's Teubner text (1910). As regards the Oxyrhynchus *Epitome* the problem was to judge how far to supplement the gaps as well as emend the existing errors of the papyrus, in order to give something like a connected text and translation. Schlesinger has noted 'only those additions or corrections to the MS. which seem either to Rossbach or to the present editor to be problematical', and he refers the critical reader to Rossbach. Only a few points call for comment. On Bk. xlvi (p. 22) Münzer made the case for *P. Decium Subulonem* (or *Subolonem*); see now E. Badian, *J.R.S.* xlvi (1956), 91; on Bk. liv (p. 50) the lacuna connected with *aqua Anio* should be marked in the translation, unless one supplements to read *ce[cidit. M. Porc]inae devota est aqua Anio* (M. Stuart, *Class. Phil.* xxxix [1944], 40), with reference to M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina; on Bk. lv (p. 56) one should surely emend *planus* to *primus* (Grenfell-Hunt). Note, too, another Oxyrhynchus fragment (*P.S.I.* xii, 1291), which may perhaps fit (under Bks. xlvi–xlviii) before *adversus Ca[rth]aginenses* (p. 20).

In discussing the text of the *Periochae* it is possible to make more of Heraeus's notes on Rossbach (in the Teubner Livy, vol. iv, 1930, p. xvii), especially since Heraeus was so expert in the Latinity of the epitomator: 'Ut in serae latinitatis auctore, tradita quam maxime conservanda erant.' Note, for example, Bk. xliv (p. 26) Mommsen's *Gali* (*Cali*, MSS.) for *Galli*; Bk. I (p. 30) conjecture *homo* before *omnium . . . vitiorum* (cf. Rossbach, p. xxxix); Bks. lxxxviii–lxxxix (pp. 110, 112) the case (in Latin MSS.) for *Afella* rather than *Ofella*; Bk. xcix (p. 122) *praeripi* instead of *praeverti*; Bk. cxvi (p. 144) add *facientibus* (cf. Val. Max. v. 7. 2) rather than *concitantibus* (Rossbach) after *adfectanti*; Bk. cxxii (p. 152) *parumper* (*parum*, MSS.) may be doubted in terms of the epitomator's usage. The fragments are based on the collections of Weissenborn, Hertz, and H. J. Müller, with few critical notes; but Schlesinger has withdrawn some false or dubious attributions (pp. 234–5). On *Obsequens* he has applied his judgement to Rossbach's text and added notes (e.g. from Pliny, *N.H.* ii) on curious points of lore. Footnotes to the translation of the *Periochae* provide sufficient reference to other historical authorities to enable the reader to grasp the context, and there are relevant maps of Spain and of the city of Rome. All in all this volume is a good introduction to what is left of Livy's account of the fall of the Roman Republic.

Clare College, Cambridge

A. H. McDONALD

BOOK I OF THE *HISTORIES* OF TACITUS

Tacite, *Histoires*, Livre i. Édition, introduction, et commentaire de PIERRE WUILLEUMIER (Collection Érasme.) Pp. iv+118+ii. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959. Paper, 5 Fr.

THIS is the second of the 'Textes latins commentés à l'usage de l'Enseignement Supérieur' published in the Collection 'Érasme' under the general editorship of M. Grimal. In a short but pithy introduction of ten pages M. Wuilleumier gives an account of Tacitus' life, his writings, their style, the manuscript tradition of the *Histories*, and a summary of the contents of the first book. The Latin text, accompanied by a concise apparatus criticus, and the commentary are printed on the same page.

The text closely resembles Fisher's Oxford Text, and little comment is needed on the few variants, none of which attempts to break new ground. At 2. 1 and 35. 1 Wuilleumier wisely reverts to the manuscript *missa* and *sistens*; at 37. 5 he accepts Constans's *petierunt*, and notes that it creates 'un contraste intéressant' with *rapuit*; but no contrast is wanted here; at 58. 2 the manuscript *statis* is kept, but it is not enough to quote Pliny as affording a parallel to *sistere* as equivalent to *sedare*: the question is whether the perfect participle passive, which commonly has the meaning of 'fixed' 'appointed', is ever used meaning *sedatus*; 64. 1 Wuilleumier accepts Koestermann's *Gallis cunctatio exempta: e<ra>t*, which deserves careful consideration.

The commentary, occupying about the same space as the text, contains a great deal of information within a comparatively brief compass; there are many examples of brilliant concision—1. 2 *accipiuntur*: 'noter la dissymétrie, l'asyndète et l'image (*pronis*; cf. chap. 54, 1); *adulationi . . . inest*: effets de parallélisme et d'assonance'; 10. 2 *expedierat*: 'même locution brachylogique chap. 88, 1; ii, 99, 1; noter le chiasme et la diversité des modes'. This gives the reader all that is strictly necessary, though he will still have to think out the details for himself. But, of course, concision must be intelligible: a note such as that on *an* in the phrase *mobilitate ingenii an ne altius scrivaretur* (7. 2)—'locution brachylogique, fréquente chez Tacite'—is itself too 'brachylogique'. In fact, though the commentary abounds in brief but suggestive comment on matters of style, purely linguistic matters receive little attention—a note on *tamquam in tanta multitudine* (8. 1) or *lugubri prospectu* (40. 1) would be welcome; the reader of Wuilleumier's commentary must either be able to read Tacitus with ease or have access to some other source for philological comment. One unfortunate feature of the comments on style is an excessive readiness to describe words or phrases as poetical: here Wuilleumier leans heavily and unwisely on Goelzer's edition of the *Histories*; so, for example, 13. 2 *subisse*: 's.-e. *animum Galbae*; expression poétique—but it is already so used by Livy (cf. Fletcher, *A. J. Ph.* [1945], p. 21); 42 fin. *transuerberatus*: 'terme poétique, emprunté à Virgile, *En.*, X, 336, 484; XI, 667—the word is found in Cicero, *ad Fam.* By contrast, comment on and explanation of events, persons, and places mentioned in the text are admirably done; facts essential for the understanding of the text are given, but the notes are not overloaded with unnecessary detail; on one or two occasions (e.g. on Fonteius Capito in 7 and Trebellius Maximus in 60) the consular dates given by Wuilleumier differ from those commonly accepted. References to resemblances and differences in the parallel versions of Suetonius, Plutarch, and Dio Cassius are succinctly given: the reader must be able and willing to look up the details for himself, but the references and, sometimes, the essential points in question are noted. There is no index, though this defect is partly compensated for by a generous amount of cross-reference within the notes.

BOOK I OF THE *ANNALS* OF TACITUS

Tacitus, *Annals* i. Edited by N. P. MILLER. Pp. x+261. London: Methuen, 1959. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

IT is over sixty years since Furneaux's edition of *Annals* i was first published, and the need for a new English edition that would take account of subsequent study of Tacitus and the early Principate has long been apparent. Miss Miller's text and commentary, joining Professor Woodcock's excellent edition, in the same series, of *Annals* xiv, is to be warmly welcomed. Her commentary offers a judicious blend of comment on style, language, and subject-matter, while her familiarity with the literature, both English and foreign, of her subject has ensured that what she has said needs little substantial modification in the light of Professor Syme's *Tacitus*, which did not appear in time to be used by her. The comments and criticisms of detail that follow must be read in conjunction with this assertion of the volume's general merit. Tacitus is a difficult author, and Miss Miller has not made him (nor tried to make him) seem easy; but her commentary affords the best introduction now available in English to the problems of language, style, and substance that he presents.

In an introduction of 48 pages the longest section is on the syntax of Tacitus (18 pages). As the notes make frequent reference to this section, it would be nice to see in the next edition marginal figures or running heads to facilitate references such as 'Introd. iv, 3 (v)'. In the section on the Life and Work of Tacitus Miss Miller's date of about A.D. 80 for the *Dialogus* now seems very dubious, and it is surprising to see it stated as probable that the *Annals* ended with xvi, leaving fourteen books for the *Histories*; and, though *Annals* xi–xvi (better xiii–xvi) show a return in some respects to a more classical style, this should not be said to be 'the more normal style of the *Histories*'. The section on 'Tacitus as an Historian' is somewhat conventional—the commentary is more adequate in its emphasis of the political aspect of Tacitus' writing—but Miss Miller avoids the 'scissors and paste' and 'Nissen's Law' fallacies. On Tacitus' style she quotes the long sentence of 2. 1 as an example of Tacitus' narrative period; the contrast she draws with a typical Livian example is excellent, but it should also be said that 2. 1 is very untypical as a Tacitean sentence. To illustrate Tacitus' use of 'variatio' she quotes the limerick (with παρὰ προσδοκίαν) 'There was an old man of Dunoon'; an unfortunate choice for an author whose chief characteristic was σεμνότης.

Miss Miller's text varies from the Oxford Text in about fifteen places all of which are noted as they occur; in two-thirds of these she has the same reading as that of Léchantin de Gubernatis's edition. At 4. 4 she not only returns to the manuscript *exulem* (*exul* O.T.) *egerit*, but explains clearly why *exulem* is the better reading; at 13. 2 and 74. 1 she accepts Syme's prosopographical improvements *M.* (*M.* O.T.) *Lepidum* and *Romano* for *Romano*. At 28. 1 she accepts, with the Oxford Text, Lipsius's emendation *claro repente*: the reader should be told what is the manuscript reading that Lipsius has emended.

The remaining remarks refer to individual notes of the commentary. 1.1 *urbem . . . habuere*, 'an hexameter line—not rhythmically a great line'; the fact is arguable, the comment unhappily phrased, as is the remark in the next note,

'not . . . the serialist's "Now Read On"'; 2. 1 *consulem . . . contentum*, a good note on the political questions; *tuta . . . periculosa*: in the figure illustrating chiasmus should not the second *a. b* be reversed? 10. 2 *abstulerat*: in spite of the indicative, it is more effective to regard *sive . . . abstulerat* as part of the O.O. The comment of the O.O. is already pejorative: an intrusion, also pejorative, by the author would be out of place. 10. 3: a note on *subdolae* might be given; so much is it an epithet of Tiberius, that its application to Augustus is surely significant. 13. 6: *an* 'as a disjunctive particle between nouns show(s) no essential difference in meaning or construction from *aut* or *uel*': this needs proof; *an* in Tacitus seems usually to be approximately 'or (could it be?)'. 14. 4 'Tacitus has either misunderstood his source or compressed it into obscurity'. This needs reconsidering in the light of Syme, Appendix 67. Neither on c. 15 nor on 81 (q.v.) does Miss Miller mention the *tabula Hebana* (for which, again, see Syme, App. 67). It is true that, whatever the correct interpretation of that disputed document, it does not impugn the veracity of Tacitus' *tum primum . . . comitia ad patres translatā sunt*, but Tacitus' silence is revealing: suppression, not of the truth, but of the inessential. 16. 3 'The two major conditions, darkness and the absence of the more stable elements, are joined by *et*: the first is then subdivided by *aut* into complete darkness and twilight': better to take *aut* as dividing the major sections and *et* as joining the two parts of the second. 19. 5 *obtinuissemus*: the subjunctive is, as Miss Miller says, that of virtual O.O., but to say either that Cicero would have written *obtenturi fuerint*, or that the O.R. would have been a vivid pluperfect indicative of the type *praeclare uiceramus nisi . . . Lepidus recipisset Antonium* is unnecessarily complicated: better to assume the O.R. to have been *obtinuimus* ('what they had not obtained'). 42. 3 *erat*, 'would be': too much is made of the moral reasons that led the Romans to use the indicative in such phrases; nor is the tense so remarkable—with the imperfect subj. in the protasis *erat*, not *est*, is the normal Latin idiom. 60. 3 *inter*: it is worth adding that anastrophe of the preposition is commonest with disyllabic prepositions, and that in the collocation noun, copula, noun, preposition the preposition is always of two syllables. 70. 4 *honestae mortis usus*: perhaps a note on *usus* is called for, especially as Miss Miller's vocabulary offers only 'employment', 'necessity'. 74. 2 *saeuitiae principis*: *principis* is curiously taken as defining genitive, 'the cruelty consisting of Tiberius' on the analogy of Homeric *βίην Διομήδεος*. This makes heavy weather of a simple possessive genitive. 74. 4 *quo . . . fieret* is dogmatically asserted to be no longer part of Tiberius' statement. Is this so? 76. 4 *quod . . . dicebatur*: Miss Miller takes *et* as 'even' and *formidolosum* as accusative: it is worth saying that *formid.* may be nominative (sc. *erat*) and *et* 'and'. 80. 2 *ut callidum*: the relationship of *ut . . . ita* is taken to be 'to some extent that of cause and effect'; surely *ut . . . ita* are adversative—the whole phrase is more damning if Tiberius' *iudicium* was *anxium* in spite of, not because of, his *callidum ingenium*. 81. 2: an editor may be pardoned for echoing Tacitus' *de comitiis consularibus . . . uix quicquam firmare ausim*, but Miss Miller, seeming to follow F. B. Marsh, makes it even more obscure: one can at least make a beginning by observing that Tacitus notes three alternatives (*modo . . . aliquando . . . plerumque*); the last, the commonest procedure, is then subdivided, *eos tantum . . . professos disseruit* and *posse et alias profiteri* (see A. H. M. Jones, J.R.S. xlvi [1955], 19).

THE GERMANIA OF TACITUS

Publius Cornelius Tacitus, *Germania*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Erläuterungen versehen von EUGEN FEHRLE; fünfte überarbeitete Auflage besorgt von RICHARD HÜNNERKOPF. Pp. 144; 8 plates, map. Heidelberg: Winter, 1959. Paper, DM 10.80.

It is thirty years since the first edition of Fehrle's translation and commentary on the *Germania* appeared; Fehrle died in 1957, and the present edition, the fifth, has been seen through the press by his colleague, Dr. Hünnerkopf, who, in addition to minor alterations and corrections, has more extensively revised the sections dealing with the forms and cults of the gods. A Latin text and a straightforward German translation facing it occupy pages 16–61. The German version is unavoidably longer than Tacitus' Latin, and to keep text and translation opposite to each other, blank spaces are left on the left-hand page after each paragraph. The heart of the work lies in the commentary, which fills the next seventy pages. There is also an index of Proper Names, a select bibliography (a more detailed list of references is given at the end of the commentary on each chapter of the text), a map, and a number of photographs, some of which will be familiar to English readers from J. G. C. Anderson's edition.

In the Preface Fehrle states that his Latin text rests on a fresh consideration of the manuscripts: at the same time he makes reference to the editions of Koestermann (Teubner, 1949) and Haas–Meister (Heidelberg, 1952). In fact, apart from small points of orthography and a few misprints (the most unfortunate being the omission of *voto* between *ne* and *quidem* at the end of c. 46), his own text, which is given without variants or apparatus criticus, has few readings that are not in one or other (or both) of Koestermann and Haas–Meister. These readings include 16. 5, where the manuscript *inscrita* is retained against Decembrio's testimony (which may have been mistaken) that Hersfeldensis read *inscientia*; 16. 11 *locis* (codd. Fehrle) where most editors prefer Acidalius' *loci*; 44. 7 *ministrantur* (codd. Fehrle) as against *ministrant* (Lipsius, edd. plerique). But the only really significant variation is the acceptance at 29. 12 of Schnetz's conjecture of *decumatos*; *agri decumati* would then be portions of the land that are left in turn to go out of cultivation in order to regain their fertility. For the arguments against this reading the reader is referred to p. 280 of Much's edition.

In general, then, the text is unpretentiously eclectic and, with the translation, is meant rather as a *point de départ* for the commentary. This is at the same time selective and discursive, reflecting in considerable measure the interests of the authors in national customs and folk-lore. So cc. 2–4 (on the *origo Germanorum*) and c. 9 (on the chief gods of the Germans) each occupy over ten pages of commentary, while in the second half the longest section is devoted to a discussion of the Nerthus cult mentioned in c. 40. Here especially Hünnerkopf draws on his own writings and is able, by adducing Norse parallels, to support his argument that it is unnecessary to look for a non-Germanic origin of the cult. It may be added that in other places too the authors incline to favour the view that most emphasizes the indigenous origin and unchanging nature of German national characteristics.

The translation seems to reproduce effectively what the authors take to be the meaning of the Latin; in the very first sentence *Gallis Raetisque et Pannonicis*

is taken as 'von den Galliern, Rätern und Pannoniern': better, perhaps, 'von den G. und von den R. und P.' There is a certain amount of expansion, e.g. *ventosior* (5. 2) is translated as 'windiger und also trockener'; in 11. 6 *nox ducere diem videtur*, *ducere* is more than 'vorangehen' ('Die Nacht geht . . . dem Tag voran').

It is perhaps fair to say that the appeal of this volume will be less to the classical specialist than to the general reader interested in German antiquity. Yet, when due allowance is made for the appeal that the *Germania* has to the national pride and consciousness of the Germans, it is both interesting and encouraging to note the continuing demand for a volume which insists that even for the general reader a scholarly study of the subject must start from the Latin text and the interpretation of Tacitus' *libellus aureus*.

University of Leeds

R. H. MARTIN

LATE LATIN

EINAR LÖFSTEDT: *Late Latin*. (Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning: Serie A: Forelesninger, xxv.) Pp. viii + 215. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1959. Paper, Kr. 25.

In 1951 the late Einar Löfstedt was invited to give a series of lectures in Oslo on late Latin as part of a programme of studies on the Migration period 400-800 A.D. Ill health prevented him from delivering the lectures. But he continued to work on the manuscript of them until his death in 1955. The final version, competently and unobtrusively translated by Dr. J. A. Willis, is a welcome addition to the work of a great scholar, and one which will reach a wider circle of readers than many of his earlier writings.

In ten chapters, corresponding to actual lectures, but often expanded far beyond the compass of a lecture, he deals with the concept of late Latin, its relation to vulgar Latin and Romance, local variations in late Latin, Christian influence, Greek influence, morphological and semantic change, and the rule of taboo and related primitive conceptions. Much of what he has to say belongs to the common stock of knowledge—to which he himself has made as great a contribution as anyone—and is illustrated by material drawn from his own earlier works and from other published works. But in every chapter there are new observations, new illustrations, new syntheses. Examples, which could be multiplied, are the analysis of the complex Latin roots of the French construction 'vivre en prince' (pp. 34-38), the brilliant piece of detective work on the origin of *per ter* = *ter* in certain limited styles and contexts (it all stems from the translation of *ēnī rpl̄s* in two passages of the N.T. 'each pregnant with a mystic significance') (pp. 85-87), the refutation, by an unimpeachable linguistic argument, of the old theory of the priority of the Latin text of St. Mark's Gospel (pp. 106-7), the convincing emendation of the unparalleled *in inde* in five passages of a tenth-century document (pp. 166-7), and the analysis of the semantic development from *tutari* to Fr. *tier* and from *necare* to Fr. *noyer* (pp. 189-94).

On a larger scale, the chief lesson which emerges is that of the continuity of Latin. The classical scholar must always be prepared to find in medieval Latin or the Romance vernaculars the illustration of some oddity in a classical

text. The Romance philologist must be ready to go right back into classical or early Latin for the origins of the phenomena with which he deals (cf. pp. 29 ff.). This is perfectly true and often forgotten; men could use words and turns of phrase in everyday speech for a thousand years without their appearing in written texts, and even when they did so appear the texts might not survive. But it is hard to determine in particular cases whether we are dealing with continuity or parallelism. And Löfstedt is perhaps inclined to over-emphasize continuity, though he warns his readers against rash assumptions that similar phenomena are genetically related, e.g. on Latin *se amare* and Fr. *s'aimer* (p. 31).

The problems with which Löfstedt deals are complex, and his treatment of them is almost always marked by balanced judgement, lucid statement of conflicting views, and distinction of the important from the trivial. These qualities make it an admirable book to put in the hands of honours students, to whom the whole field will be unfamiliar. Here and there, however, one can find passages which the author would have been likely to modify, had he lived.

For instance, the statement that 'the ancient world during its last centuries was largely bilingual' (p. 15) needs so much qualification that it is misleading as it stands. Courcelle, in his well-documented history of Greek studies in the Latin west in the fifth and sixth centuries (*Les Lettres grecques en occident de Macrobius à Cassiodore*, 2nd ed. 1948), has shown how few people were really able to interpret between the two worlds. And Löfstedt's own pupil, S. Lundström, has recently demonstrated how poor the interpreting often was (*Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. li, 3, 1955). Again, some of the semantic developments which Löfstedt cites as evidence of the vitality of medieval Latin could equally well be interpreted as mere translations from the vernacular, and hence evidence of lack of vitality, e.g. *sedere = esse* in twelfth-century Spanish texts (pp. 65–66), or *respondere quod sic* in a fifteenth-century French text (pp. 66–67). In this connexion the position of medieval Latin in the High Middle Ages was surely very different in regions of Romance and of non-Romance vernacular; and within each of these further subdivisions might be made. This aspect of the question is not treated by Löfstedt.

Löfstedt's discussion of Greek influences (pp. 88–119) is penetrating and balanced. But he might have added that a vast amount of the abstract and technical vocabulary of Latin is made up of semantic calques (*Bedeutungslehwwörter*) from Greek, which then in their turn served as models for similar new creations in the languages of modern Europe. *Συνείδησις—conscientia—Gewissen—sanctitudine—sōvest*, etc., is a typical case.

Iterare = iter facere (p. 161) is in a different category from most of the strange semantic changes recorded in Chapter 8; once the normalized *iter*, *iteris* (Naeivius, Accius, Iuvencus, etc.) is established, it arises by a process of derivation fertile all through the history of Latin, and is no more unusual than *generare* or *temperare*. In connexion with the specialization of *labor* in the sense of 'labour in the fields' (pp. 147–8), which Löfstedt discussed at greater length in *Eranos*, xliv (1946), 347–50, he might have mentioned that *κάματος* undergoes a similar development in late Greek (e.g. Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 394. 5 De Boor). Direct influence or parallel development? Probably the latter. And if *κάματος* is cognate with Mycenean *ka-ma*, *ka-ma-e-u* (and Hesychius' gloss *καμαν = τὸν ἀγρόν*), is its late Greek specialization a sign of continuity of linguistic tradition or not? But this would have taken the author too far from his subject.

In a course of ten lectures one must be selective. But it seems a pity that Löfstedt says little or nothing on the syntax of the complex sentence in late Latin, which so strongly influenced the developing syntactical patterns of the vernaculars.

The study of the development of the Romance languages from Latin was the laboratory in which methods were perfected which were later extended to the Indo-European languages as a whole, and then to other language families. Löfstedt's book, and particularly his chapters on morphological and semantic change, will be of interest to many scholars not directly concerned with late Latin. For those who are so concerned it is a book to be read and reread for its wealth of suggestion and illustration and the thoroughness of its documentation. A series of indexes and a select bibliography make it easy to consult. There are a few misprints, and the only one likely to give the reader pause is a confusing *too* for *two* on p. 167.

Forty-eight years ago Löfstedt wrote 'Ich bin nämlich der Überzeugung, daß die Erforschung des Spätlateins, wenn sie wirklich der lateinischen Philologie neue und wichtige Wege eröffnen will, von etwas anderen Methoden als bisher arbeiten muß' (*Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 1911, p. 3). His last book, its pages dotted with the names of his pupils, is a measure of the success with which that early conviction was translated into practice. *Si monumentum requiris, circumspece.*

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

TRANSLATION

R. A. BROWER (editor) and others: *On Translation*. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 23.) Pp. xi+297. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 52s. net.

TRANSLATION, both as a scholastic exercise and as an art essential to modern civilization, has lately been receiving the attention and respect often denied to it by professional scholars and by writers less perceptive than André Gide and Paul Valéry. Three recent books (to name no more) place the subject in its modern setting: Eric Jacobsen's *Translation, A Traditional Craft* (Copenhagen, 1958) traced the history of translation as a humanistic discipline; in *Aspects of Translation* (1958) writers associated with a research centre in University College, London, treated the subject among their studies in 'Communication'—that comprehensive term embracing everything from the techniques of interpretation at international conferences to the methods of 'selling an idea' in commerce or industry. Last year appeared the book under review.

Its plan is explained in the editor's Introduction. Section i, headed 'Translators on Translating', groups together nine essays or 'practical reports' covering translation from a wide variety of languages ancient and modern. It is mostly concerned with the imaginative act which translation involves. In Section ii, headed 'Approaches to the Problem', there are seven essays, sharing some ground with those of Section i but in general more concerned with theory and principles, or with peripheral interests. Here, for example, the editor contributes a (most readable) essay on 'Seven Agamemnons', showing how much the historian of ideas and cultures may learn from translations widely separated in time and each revealing contemporary modes, social, poetic, and critical.

Here too W. W. Quine analyses the process of translating a language hitherto unknown and thereby defines 'empirical meaning'; while Roman Jakobson writes on 'Linguistic Aspects of Translation'; and A. G. Oettinger on 'Automatic (Transference, Translation, Remittance, Shunting)'—a development not surprising to those who have read of the Latin-verse-making machine constructed, it is said, by the German mechanician Professor Faber and exhibited in 1845 at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly.¹ Section iii (and last) is a critical bibliography of works on translation, prepared by B. Q. Morgan. It does not claim to be complete; and if the critical notes are sometimes too short to give much guidance, one should not complain, for the period covered extends from 46 B.C. (Cicero) to 1958. Omissions which I happened to notice were *Translation (London)* and *Translation*, collections of new work by various hands put together by Neville Braybrooke and Elizabeth King and published by the Phoenix Press, London, in 1945 and 1947 respectively; *Primum Graius Homo*, by B. Farrington (Cambridge, 1927); and 'On Translating Poetry', a lecture delivered by Cecil Day Lewis from the Chair of Poetry at Oxford in 1953 and published that year in *Chance, New Writing and Art*, No. 4, at 2 Draycott Place, London, S.W. 3. These last two items should have a place in any future edition of the bibliography.

My review must be confined almost entirely to the 'practical reports' by translators of the Classics; but I cannot forbear to mention the essay by Eugene A. Nida which opens the book. It deals with the principles exemplified by translation of the Bible—or parts of it—into 1,109 languages, including such exotics as Chokwe (Central Africa), Hiligaynon (Philippines), Quechua (Bolivia), Tarahumara (Mexico). In range and depth and in clearness of exposition it seems to me in a class by itself; and it throws light on many of the terms and allusions used by the later writers.

The 'practical reports' to be considered are: 'The Poetic Nuance' by Dudley Fitts (hereinafter F); 'On translating Greek Poetry' by Richmond Lattimore (L); and 'Latin and English Verse' by Rolfe Humphries (H).² All three writers have translated primarily (or so I suppose) for readers in the United States, where 'The Classics in Translation' is a subject forming part of many different courses;³ all three demand 'a poem for a poem'; and all advocate the use of 'contemporary poetic idiom'. Reflecting on these points I approach my task with great diffidence. If I am wrong about the purpose of these translators, I cannot gauge their success in fulfilling it. Any judgement on the principles derived from their work must therefore be insecure. 'Poetic idiom', too, must include niceties of diction, perhaps not the same on both sides of the Atlantic. L, for example, when translating τρίποδι βροτῷ λοιτ in Hesiod, *Op.* 533, writes

¹ See Chambers' *Edinburgh Journal* of 30 March 1850 for a discussion of its mechanism and of the 'Artificial (Latin) Versifying' invented by John Peters, 29 Sept. 1677, and recorded in Solomon Lowe's *Arithmetic*, London, 1749. An illustration of the machine and some details of its performance are given in the *Illustrated London News* of 21 July 1945. It produced hexameters, about one a minute, playing the National Anthem on a cylinder during their composition and 'Fly not yet' while the line was being broken up.

² The principal translations on which

these reports are based are: (a) by F: *Alcestis* (1936), *Anth. Pal.*, selections (1938, reissued 1957), *Antigone* (1940), *Oedipus Tyrannus* (with R. Fitzgerald, 1951), *Lysistrata* (1955), *Frogs* (1957), *Birds* (1958); (b) by L: *Pindar* (1947), *Iliad* (1951), *Oresteia* (1954); Greek Lyrics, including some elegiac poems (1955), Hesiod (1959); (c) by H: *Aeneid* (1951), Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (1957).

³ Cf. G. Hight, *People, Places and Books* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 223.

'like the three-footed *individual*'. I shudder at the 'colloquial vulgarity'—see H. W. Fowler, s.v. in *Modern English Usage*. But it may be good American? In this situation I shall confine myself to the safe and sensible course of showing where the three writers disagree.

They disagree, first of all, about the representation of formal elements. F is so keenly aware of the essential differences between classical and modern prosody and metre and so sensitive to the untranslatable nuances of sound and tone, that he dismisses as 'mistaken enthusiasts' and creators of 'literary curiosities' rather than of poems those who attempt to reproduce quantitative metres in English. Equally dissatisfied with other attempts to match classical verse on the formal side, he suggests the possibility of 'a parallel art . . . that will find in the resources of its own language an answer to, and not merely a representation of, the special totality of the original'; in other words it will give the translator in its effect on mind and feelings an experience comparable to that which the original gives him, but without necessarily bearing any formal resemblance at all. A specimen of this 'parallel art' is given below.

Both L and H are at variance with F. In *Greek Lyrics* L attempted 'close approximations' to the original metres;¹ and his *Iliad*, 'though not based on any quantitative theory', aimed nevertheless at 'a speed and rhythm analogous to' those of the original, while in thought, expression, and substance he 'tried hard' to make it as plain and direct as Homer had seemed to Matthew Arnold. The translator's chief object, he says, 'is perhaps this: to make from the Greek poem a poem in English which, while giving a high minimum of the meaning of the Greek, is still a new English poem' and one 'which would not be the kind of poem it is if it were not translating the Greek which it translates'.

H sides with L in advocating formal relationship. He thinks that the difficulty of converting quantitative into accentual metres has been 'greatly exaggerated'; for the translator, whether intentionally or not, 'is bound', he says, 'to bring over some quantitative effects, . . . some alternation between his long and short syllables, some counter-pointing of length against stress, some coincidence of brevity and slack'. More troublesome, in his opinion, to match in English is the great variety on which Latin insists among feet within the line. But no troubles deter him. He even urges that translation from Latin should have about it something distinctive, 'sounding a little harder, more (as Garrod has said) with the sound of a great nation in it than our mutable speech naturally contrives'. For the reader's sake this effect should be 'more familiar than strange';² yet in justice to the author translated 'some hint, at least of his quality, some suspicion of his foreign accent, must be kept'. Similarly the styles of different authors must be distinguished; his *Juvenal*, he hopes, will not sound like his *Ovid*.

Next, although F, L, and H agree in demanding a poem for a poem—and a 'contemporary' poem at that—I suspect that F's views on poetry are not shared by the other two. When translating from the *Greek Anthology* in 1938 his purpose 'in general' had been 'to compose first of all, and as simply as possible,

¹ Some of these 'approximations' I find far from 'close', e.g. 'How long will you lie idle, and when will you find some courage, / you young men? Have you no shame of what other cities will say?' (an elegiac couplet from Callinus); and 'In the beginning God

made various kinds of women / with various minds. He made one from the hairy sow' (iambics from Semonides).

² He admires L's *Iliad*, but it does sometimes 'bother his ear' because 'the strange seems to override the familiar'.

an English poem, but one which discarded poetisms'. This rendering of Palladas (*A.P.* xi. 381) is a specimen:

Only twice is womankind
Anything but an affliction: (1) in bride-bed
&
(2) in the grave.

He seems to have been content with the communication of ideas and images and to have regarded the basic idea as the poem, not the language used to express it. Other Muses have pastured on thistles in the same waste land. When the book was reissued in 1957 his preface stated that the poems could not be recast without causing great confusion, but that his theories had been radically changed. This change and his advance towards the 'parallel art' of which he speaks may be seen, I take it, in that part of his essay where Martial ii. 15 (hendecasyllabics) is translated as follows:

You let no one drink from your personal cup, Hormus, when the toasts go round the table.
Haughtiness?

Haughtiness?

Hell, no.

Humanity,

He explains that he has not substituted a 'free cadence' for the 'metrical dance' of the original; for 'the lines are measured, scaled down phrase by phrase in accordance with a symmetrical pattern, and the repetition of *h* does its part to bring about what the Elizabethans called a "close"'. Personally I should not call these lines a poem at all, but prose with a metrical drift, as may be shown by Walter de la Mare's¹ method of adding a rhymed continuation:

Please don't use the sink when it's time to wash up, there's a handy horse-trough by the stable.

To blur the distinctions between prose and verse which the ancients observed seems to me treachery in gross.

L holds that contemporary verse offers the translator a variety of forms hitherto unmatched. From among them, when not attempting his approximations to quantitative metres, he has chosen 'a free six-beat line' to represent Greek hexameters and a free five-beat line for tragic iambics. He writes in his 'own poetical language', which is 'mostly the plain English of to-day'. To him Greek verse in translation must 'read as modern English verse and yet not like any modern English verse ever yet written'; the form-base must guard it 'from the pompous or the ponderous as we find it in pseudo-Milton or pseudo-Shakespeare, and from the querulous, fatigued, self-pitiful progress of pseudo-Eliot, pseudo-Auden, or pseudo-Pound'. One might object that L's *Iliad* is pseudo-Bridges; but having myself suggested, as long ago as 1931, the adaptation of Bridges's metre to the rendering of Homer² and others, I must forgo this comment and note only that L's faithful retention of Homeric epithets does give his English verse a Greek cachet.

H avoids all archaism in his verse, but shows no great break with tradition in metre. In his *Aeneid* he uses 'a loose iambic pentameter', speeded up where

¹ *Poetry in Prose* (Warton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1935), especially p. 37.

² The *Testament of Beauty* first appeared in 1929. Shortly afterwards Michael Balkwill

won the Newdigate Prize with a poem in the same metre, which he tried, at my request, for rendering *Iliad* xii. 277-89 and other pieces to be found in the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*, a.v., p. lxxxix.

necessary,'¹ and sometimes shortened in the Virgilian manner to a half-line. He has tried to 'make it sound to the reader, whenever he can, the way it feels to himself'. His metre in the *Metamorphoses* is essentially the same, though he calls it 'a loose ten-beat line'. Ovid's hexameters, he says, 'do not sound at all like Virgil's'; but in translation the differences can hardly be expected to show through. He might perhaps have made his *Aeneid* less brisk and neat, and kept those qualities for Ovid.

Another subject on which the three writers disagree is that of the translator's right to omit or abridge. F does not treat the subject directly in his essay, apart from implying that witticisms which can neither be effectively rendered nor survive exegesis are best omitted. But in the Preface to his *Frogs* he extends this principle to 'local references and other details' and claims more freedom in lyric and choral passages than in dialogue. I notice, too, that in *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1234 ff. he gives four words, 'The Queen is dead', for thirteen of the Greek. Acting-versions, especially in treatment of choric odes, must clearly have rules of their own and may base themselves without reproach upon Somerset Maugham's two maxims for playwrights: 'stick to the point and whenever you can, cut.'²

L is against cuts, including those of Greek compound adjectives. 'The translator', he says, 'may have to swallow hard, but he must translate in full.' H, on the other hand, frankly confesses 'I am apt to abridge' (cf. p. xii of his *Aeneid*). He pleads an obligation to the original author, whose modern audience must not be bored, e.g. with catalogues of personal feats or of place-names that can have little interest today.

Space forbids the treatment of any further topic raised by these three writers; but in passing I may mention one which they all omit, namely the imaginative act of translation from English into Greek and Latin prose and verse. This exercise, so long established in this country, makes many problems of the reverse process seem familiar and even commonplace. I must also register my agreement with Jackson Mathews, another contributor to this book: that translations in verse, being poems in their own right even though sparked off by another's thought, should be 'given the position of privilege, by themselves, and followed by the originals with facing prose translations, the three in one volume' (p. 77). Yet the 'free five- or six-beat lines' of modern verse may serve very often to put prose, their close relation, out of office.

Trinity College, Oxford

T. F. HIGHAM

GREEK NEGATIVES

A. C. MOORHOUSE: *Studies in the Greek Negatives*. Pp. xi + 163. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959. Cloth, 21s. net.

B. T. KOPPERS: *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek and some other Indo-European Languages*. Pp. 133. Utrecht: privately printed, 1959. Paper.

THESE two books exemplify radically different views of the mechanism of language: one (Moorhouse) which is descriptive and positivistic, classifying sentences by 'types' in the belief that 'it is by the examination of distinct types

¹ e.g. *Aen.* iv. 565 ff.: 'Seize the moment / While it can still be seized, and hurry, hurry! / The sea will swarm with ships, the fiery

torches / Blaze, and the shore rankle with fire by morning. / Shove off, be gone.'

² *The Summing Up*, p. 121.

of phrase or sentence that further progress in the study of Greek word-order seems most likely to be made' (p. v); the other (Koppers), in a tradition most characteristic of French philologists, insisting that two formulations which appear to be synonymous *must* be different in meaning or 'feeling' and that it is possible to draw semantic or psychological distinctions between *οὐ* and *μή* which will be valid for all instances.

'As too many phenomena', says Koppers (p. 40), 'are explained by means of "attraction" and "analogy" I rather think this an easy method of getting off cheaply, and it is more likely that we must accept it that speakers and writers are not engaged in playing us false, but that they use just the negations proper for the purpose of expressing their thoughts, feelings and intentions.' This uncompromising faith, in which the author wavers only occasionally (e.g. in speaking of 'levelling developments', p. 85, cf. 124 f.), is objectionable on several grounds. First (though least important) it should be said that linguistic hypotheses are historical; they profess to tell us the thoughts of dead men; and whether or not such a hypothesis is 'easy' or 'cheap' has no bearing on whether or not it is true, i.e. has the demonstrable coherence required of any historical hypothesis. Secondly, it is certain that attraction and analogy are the principal mechanism of the formation of words and inflectional series—Moorhouse (pp. 47 ff.) on the history of *ἀ(ν)-ἀντα-νη-* reveals, as it were, the ecology of a small area of the jungle—and it would be remarkable if what has such power over words should have none over complexes of words. Thirdly, whatever moment in the history of a language we choose to study, we find that each type of word-group has a history and a future; it has encroached upon other types, and has been encroached on by them, and it is destined to expansion or contraction in later times. It follows that at any given moment some types are encroaching upon others. That is to say, either speakers are ignoring part of the time semantic distinctions which they observe at other times, or they are undergoing changes of outlook which are reflected by the expansion of one formulation at the expense of another. The latter hypothesis is not wholly incredible, but it has its limitations; quite possibly the original expansion of *ὁ* in the direction which eventually led to a definite article reflected a change in feeling and in the conception of the matter of discourse, but Plato's use of the definite article does not in itself signify a difference of outlook or conception between him and Homer. The fact is, I think, that the formulation of any actual utterance is the product of the speaker's subconscious selection of relevant models from the whole of his linguistic experience; there are many kinds of relevance, and if we call *εἰ δὲ οὐ φῆσαι* 'irregular' we mean that, whereas the general model *οὐ*+indicative does not usually prevail over the general model *εἰ δὲ μή*, the specific model *οὐ φῆσαι* has been strong enough (i.e. familiar enough) to do so. Every such victory slightly increases that model's chance of victory in the next conflict.

In arguing that *οὐ* is 'objective' and 'static' negation, *μή* 'subjective' and 'dynamic' (pp. 40, 87 f.), and that *οὐ* indicates 'acceptance' of the negative situation (pp. 45, 52, 57, 67) while *μή* 'waves away' the positive (pp. 45, 73), Koppers is taking up a comfortable position in a closed circle. Refutation of the statement that *μή* in such and such a passage is 'subjective' is no more practicable than its demonstration, and appeal to 'emphasis' is inconclusive. When, for example, she says (p. 68) that in Hdt. i. 212. 3 *εἰ δὲ ταῦτα οὐ ποιήσεις* 'the stress is on "do", not on "not", and, of course, on "that"', what

is left to a reviewer except the counter-assertion that in *his* translation all the stress is on 'not', none on 'do', and little on 'that'?

Despite this, as it seems to me, mistaken approach, many of Koppers's discussions of particular passages are sensitive and useful (e.g. *Od.* ii. 274 f., p. 58). She makes abundant use of parallels from Latin (where her approach to *nisi / si non* is similar in character to her approach to *ei μή / ei οὐ*) and from Dutch and German, where the presence or absence of stress on *niet* and *nicht* permits a refined psychological classification of conditional protases. She is less at home with English, as she bases one argument (pp. 84 f.) on the belief that 'unless' can be stressed on the first syllable and that this stress makes a semantic distinction. She strikes some splendid blows (pp. 16 f., 19, 107) at theorists who derive all the meanings of a word from one original meaning or speak of Homeric Greek as if Homer came fresh from Babel and paratactic innocence.

Moorhouse's treatment of 'emphasis' is very much more cautious. A large part of his book deals with the position of the negative in the sentence, but he does not regard 'emphasis' as the sole determinant of word-order. The logical relations between what is said and its context, rhythmical patterns, and the presence of particularly familiar associations, all play a part in determining word-order, and on occasions pull different ways. He recognizes A. Loepfe, *Die Wortstellung im griechischen Sprechsatz* (Freiburg i. d. Schweiz, 1940) as an exceptionally significant contribution to the study of word-order, but he discerns and corrects (pp. 78 ff.) some of the weaknesses in Loepfe's application of principles to cases. These weaknesses, like the rigidity and complexity of Loepfe's classification of the logical elements in a clause, spring from the belief that every clause has one *rhemma* (psychological predicate) and only one. Moorhouse (pp. 81 f.) suggests that there are clauses with no *rhemata*; I would prefer to say that there are clauses with half a dozen apiece, and that the terminology of 'logical' (or 'psychological') 'subject' and 'predicate' is at the root of the trouble, but perhaps we mean much the same in the end. Moorhouse presents in detail the useful and interesting results, including statistics based on a discriminating classification and amplified by discussion of individual passages, of a study of types of negative word-group. The process of classification is inseparable from formulation of the criteria of 'nexal' and 'special' negation (with which the first two chapters of the book are concerned) and of the differences between *οὐ* and *μή*. Both these distinctions are ultimately semantic, but any discussion of detail—as, for instance, pp. 28 ff. on *οὐ* and *μή* as 'special' negatives in 'negative combinations'—suffices to show how much more illuminating is Moorhouse's historical study of the interaction of types than the most determined attempts to discern differences of 'feeling'.

University of St. Andrews

K. J. DOVER

THE INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

WALTER PORZIG: *Die Gliederung des Indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Pp. 251. Heidelberg: Winter, 1954. Paper, DM. 35.

The comparative study of the Indo-European languages has throughout its short history been directed chiefly towards establishing the framework of the parent language and the processes by which its descendants evolved from it. Inevitably, however, scholars have tried from time to time to determine who spoke the parent language and where they lived and to bring linguistic fact

and theory into relationship with archaeological and historical information. Such investigations are associated with Schrader and others; although by no means unsuccessful, they have often come to a halt or foundered because linguistic and archaeological data cannot as yet be satisfactorily reconciled. In the last fifty years or so, linguists have generally been content to trace the origin and migrations of the Indo-European-speaking peoples in relative terms only, leaving archaeology aside. A welcome stimulus to this abstracted type of inquiry was given in 1908 by A. Meillet's *Les Dialectes Indo-européens*, and since then a considerable number of variant solutions and amendments have been put forward. Porzig has undertaken in this book the formidable task of assembling this material and condensing it into 200 pages (plus indexes) and of putting forward his own interpretation as well.

The first chapter, comprising a fifth of the text, deals with the history of the question. In the second Porzig gives a brief account of his own method of solving it. He is interested in identifying linguistic innovations which are common to two or more I.E. languages and in establishing the relative chronology of such innovations. By this means he hopes to show that various languages were in contact with each other geographically at various times and so to establish a diagram of the distribution of I.E. dialects in the prehistoric period. He uses archaeological evidence only to a very limited extent and in the most general terms.

In Chapter 3 Porzig goes on to discuss the main phonological distinctions observable in the earliest-known phases of I.E. speech-treatment of syllabic liquids and nasals and of aspirated voiced stops, the inter-relationships of guttural stops and fricatives, the development of I.E. *tt*, *sr*, and final *m*, and the Germanic and Armenian consonantal shifts. Chapter 4 contains a summary of morphological differences in the same style; there is a lucid sketch of mediopassive *r* and other sections are concerned with tense-systems, case-endings, and verbs of 'durative action'.

Chapter 5 and 6 list the points of resemblance that can be discovered to exist between pairs of languages, first in western and central Europe and secondly in eastern Europe and Asia. The sections in Chapter 5 on the connexions between Italic and Celtic, Italic and Illyrian, and Italian and Germanic are of special interest and importance to classical scholars. Those in Chapter 6 which discuss Greek in relation to Thracian and Phrygian, Armenian, Aryan, and Baltic and Slavonic will have a similar attraction. Needless to say, however, the parts that discuss Germanic with Baltic and Slavonic, Aryan with Armenian, and so on, are an essential complement to those that refer specifically to Latin and Greek.

Finally, in Chapter 7, Porzig gathers together his conclusions. He finds that the original I.E. linguistic area was split into two main dialect-groups—a Western, including Celtic, Latin, Osco-Umbrian, Germanic, and probably Illyrian, and an Eastern, which is made up of Aryan, Baltic, Slavonic, Greek, Armenian, Thracian, and Phrygian, and in some sense also Hittite, Tocharian, and Albanian. The split between the two groups was at first incomplete; Germanic and Illyrian in the western group were for a long time in contact with Baltic, Slavonic, Tocharian, and Thracian in the eastern group. During this period certain innovations occurred which crossed the border between east and west but did not affect the languages on the outer edges of either main group—Italic and Celtic in the west, Aryan and Baltic in the east. Within the

western group the close relationships between Italic and Germanic point to common economic conditions and common social institutions at a certain stage; the links between Italic and Celtic or between Germanic and Illyrian are similar in kind but less pervasive. In the other group Baltic and Slavonic in the north were closely related to Tocharian on the one hand and to Albanian on the other, while Albanian shows one or two contacts of a special nature with Illyrian. Southwards of Baltic and Slavonic lay the area from which Aryan, Armenian, Thracian, and Phrygian later spread. To begin with, Hittite and also Greek were located in this area, but first the one and then the other were separated from it by migratory movements.

At the end of the book there are good indexes of I.E. word-stems and of words quoted from individual languages, also of modern authorities and of subject-matter. In several of the chapters short bibliographies are given on specific questions.

The book is by no means easy to read; even those who are acquainted with the earlier literature will find the going heavy in places. This is not due to any fault in exposition; on the contrary, every part of the discussion is clear and succinct, and the arrangement is excellent. Difficulties arise mainly because so much diverse material has been packed into so short a book. It would have been helpful if the author had added to the indexes a number of diagrams showing the distribution among the various I.E. dialects of the features which he lists and discusses in the text; in some cases, too, annotated maps might have been welcome.

It might be supposed that Porzig's conclusions differ little from those reached by some of his predecessors, e.g. those of Bonfante (p. 47), or that after searching discussion of things great and small relatively little of substance has emerged. Such an attitude would be mistaken. The outstanding merit of the book is that it presents the evidence with scrupulous fairness and the results with balance and restraint. Porzig's objectivity is particularly well seen in his treatment of Venetic, Illyrian, Thracian, and other languages of doubtful affinity.

A serious fault of all books and articles on this subject is that they must rely to a very considerable extent on the argument from silence. Languages *a* and *b* agree with each other in respect of six features which languages *c*, *d*, *e*, and *f* do not possess; therefore *a* and *b* are related I.E. dialects and were once in close geographical proximity to each other. If one or two of the six features turns up in a newly discovered text of *c*, *d*, *e*, or *f* or if they are recognized to exist in previously known texts where they had not been suspected, the argument is either weakened or destroyed. Porzig is, of course, well aware of this danger and by his cautious approach has done all that he could to make his interpretation secure. One may sometimes disagree with his interpretation of particulars or withhold assent, but in the end one is bound to admire his handling of this thorny problem.

University of Edinburgh

A. J. BEATTIE

LYDIAN STUDIES

ALFRED HEUBECK: *Lydiaka. Untersuchungen zu Schrift, Sprache und Götternamen der Lyder.* (Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A, Bd. 9.) Pp. 90. Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1959. Paper, DM 8.

LYDIAN, like the better-attested Lycian, is fairly generally considered to be a late remnant of the Anatolian group of Indo-European languages, of which the principal members are Cuneiform Hittite, Luwian, and Hieroglyphic Hittite. Heubeck's first object of investigation, and the one which produces most to interest classical scholars, is the Lydian letter \uparrow . This sign has been almost universally interpreted as *p*, on the strength of two important words, $+λdāns$, identified with *Ἄπόλλων*, and the title $+aλmūs$, borrowed into Greek as *παλμύς* (Hippomax and, as a proper name, in the *Iliad*). Heubeck rejects the identification of $+λdāns$ with Apollo, partly on phonetic grounds, partly because the association of $+λdāns$ with *artimus*-Artemis is scarcely reflected by that of Apollo with Artemis in the Greek inscriptions of Lydia. In these Artemis is coupled with *Mήν*; since the latter is often called *μέγας* and *τύραννος*, and described as *βασιλεύων* a particular community, and since Lyd. *tavšas* is accepted as 'great' on the strength of Hes. *ταύς μέγας, πολύς*, Heubeck interprets the divine title $+λdāns tavšas$ as *βασιλεύων μέγας*, with substantivized participle, the title being used instead of the name *Mήν*. This permits the identification of $+λdāns$ with another Hesychian gloss, *κοαλδδεων βασιλέα. Λυδοί.* Assuming that *o* is used here, as in some other cases, to denote the sound *w*, Heubeck revalues \uparrow as a labio-velar; $+aλmūs$ must then have been borrowed at a time when labio-velars still existed in Greek, and have participated in the normal Greek development of these sounds to give *παλμύς*. Heubeck's argument, of which this is a bare outline, is most ingenious, and leads him through several interesting excursions, including one on Mopsus, and to a study of labio-velars and the words attesting them in the Anatolian group. There are perhaps some weaker links in the chain. For example, no exact Lydo-Greek evidence is cited for *βασιλεύων μέγας*; in the Greek inscriptions here quoted the god's name is always given, with *βασιλεύων* as a true participle in apposition to it and governing *τὴν κώμην* or the like.

In the second part Heubeck supports the view that the letter \uparrow represents a dental fricative. Here he has no glosses or loan-words to help in fixing the sound value, and it could be held that his arguments merely confirm a correlation with Indo-European dentals. This, however, is in itself a good deal to achieve, and in upholding his thesis Heubeck treats some words of special interest for Hittitologists, as well as suggesting an unattested Lydian word $*tukō-$ to account for the loan-words *οὐκόν* (Boeot. *τυκόν*), *ficus*.

In the third part of his book Heubeck discusses some of the features of Lydian which are most relevant to its position in the Anatolian group of Indo-European languages, and comments briefly on others. In this field caution befits one who is not a specialist in these languages, but he may perhaps be allowed to risk a speculation. On the preterite in *-l*, one of the most striking Lydian formations, Heubeck (p. 80) says only 'Allein unter den "heth." Sprachen steht das Lyd.'. Kronasser (*Vergl. Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, pp. 231 ff.) had compared it to the Slavonic *l*-participle used to form the preterite. It might be added, first, that if this preterite is in origin an indeclinable active participle in *-l*, it goes well with the indeclinable passive participle in *-v* recognized by Heubeck, pp. 66–67 (following Meriggi, *R.H.A.* iii [1935], 78); second, that an *l*-participle (though declined) is recognized for another Anatolian language also, Hieroglyphic Hittite (L. R. Palmer, *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1958, 46).

ROMAN HISTORY

H. H. SCULLARD: *From the Gracchi to Nero; a History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68.* Pp. ix+450; 4 maps. London: Methuen, 1959. Cloth, 25s. net.

DR. SCULLARD's latest book will place all serious students of Roman history still further in his debt. From the early history of Rome and the politics of 220-150 B.C. he has now moved into the critical period of the Roman revolution. The subject is well chosen. If the troubles of the Republic took shape in the second century B.C. and led to the rule of Augustus, it is equally true that the implications of Augustus' policy for good and ill only became manifest under the Julio-Claudian emperors. The theme is one of power, at first shifting and temporary, then established in permanence. Yet, if we should know not only why ambitious men quarrel but what they neglect in doing so, and how their problems ultimately catch up with them, it is important to have a comprehensive and judicious account. Scullard's merit is to have provided such a reconstruction of the conditions and events. His interpretation is sober, even in the midst of dramatic upheavals; yet in all truth the situation was serious enough, not least where the main issues of law and order and welfare were obscured by the political struggle.

Scullard poses the problem of Roman government as one of political morality and begins by sketching the various sections of the State so as to envisage their needs and responsibilities in the light of the changes that they were undergoing: the Senate and provinces, the people and knights, and the Italian allies, under the impact of wealth and slavery and developments in the rural economy. His analysis serves to distinguish the sectional interests, and we can follow the course of the conflict to which they gave rise. But how did the unstable balance of the mid-second century so suddenly collapse? A short account of the years 150-133 B.C. would have helped. Or, rather, there was reason to attempt a more dynamic study of the interaction of the conflicting interests which precipitated a general state of political chaos, so that no single problem could be calmly considered in its own light. Two main points come to mind, the first economic and the second political.

First, it seems that an expansion of small industries in Rome and the Italian towns during the wars drew population from the country-side even before the small farmer lost his land. This development affected not only the knights and urban citizens but also the allies. Along with new money and cheap labour it encouraged farming for markets—as much on small estates as on the great latifundia—and this led to an extension of control from Rome to the allied communities. Such progress and its subsequent recession will account for the condition of the urban proletariat, the difficulty of levying troops, and Rome's relations with the Italian allies, not as separate questions but as parts of a single complex situation. Tiberius Gracchus tackled it at one point, Gaius more comprehensively. It probably influenced much of what happened under Marius and Sulla, not to mention Catiline's revolt, and we find it prominent in the policy of Caesar and Augustus. In any event some such formula is worth applying to Scullard's useful details.

Secondly, the Gracchi provoked an immediate struggle for power in the

State. As long as the Senate held its ground, we have to emphasize the corruption of *clientela* as a political instrument of the dominant noble families that were to constitute the Optimates. Then it will be possible to feel the counter-force that drove able and ambitious men to seize power as Populares by direct action in the Tribal Assembly as well as by independence in the consulship; to which may be added after Marius the deadly effect of military *clientela* as it was developed under Sulla. The Senate had inherited a claim on emergency action within the State, which extremists would press (in the *senatus consultum ultimum*) even against Caesar. In the face of this threat the Populares relied not only upon their armies but upon their veterans, until Augustus used *clientela* as a party chief and as a national leader to establish the *auctoritas* that enabled him to govern Rome as Princeps. So much again for a formula, which Scullard might have applied more strongly to the earlier part of the period. He brings it into full play in treating Augustus.

As regards the narrative of events from 133 to 31 B.C. there is little need for detailed comment. Scullard maintains his high standard of accuracy and provides excellent notes on controversial questions. On Marius and the state of the Roman army one may mention the recent work of R. E. Smith, *Service in the Post-Marian Roman Army*, which gives a clearer picture of developments to the military organization of Augustus. The strong position of Pompeius Strabo may have embarrassed Sulla rather more than is normally assumed (see E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*), and it certainly explains the rise of Pompey. Scullard lays undue stress on Crassus during Pompey's Eastern command; for Crassus' lack of success is palpable, and Sallust shows the Optimates back in power. On the First Triumvirate—and indeed throughout this period—it is important to consult R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*. Not that Scullard ignores this work: the point is one of emphasis in the interpretation of internal politics; and in fact he restores the balance by his interest in the problems of the Roman world as a whole, which leads to a more sympathetic verdict on the achievement of Augustus.

Though the first task in studying the establishment of the Principate is to reconstruct the steps by which Augustus secured his position, this is immediately complicated by the need for general interpretation in handling the details. In particular, the *Res Gestae* presses the Republican precedents and obscures the dominating effect of Augustus' powers (e.g. in his *imperium*), while Dio Cassius colours his account with something of the later absolutism. Thus one should go beyond the Republican view of *auctoritas* but stop short of a formal conception of imperial *cura rei publicae*. In the light of recent research, which has canvassed the problem in all its degrees, Scullard presents an admirable survey of the course of events, and his notes guide the reader to the points of difficulty. He places in perspective not only the settlement of 23 B.C. but the critical years that followed until 19 B.C., and traces the long period during which the Princeps consolidated his position, organized the State, and prepared to transmit his power. His analysis is accompanied by sketches of the functions of the Senate and the executive, the condition of Rome and Italy, and Augustus' social and religious reforms, as well as the place of literature in the period; note especially his discussion of Aerarium and Fiscus, coinage, *destinatio* in elections, Consilium Principis, and the rise of emperor worship. Then a useful chapter treats the army, frontier policy, and the administration of the provinces.

All this calls for little comment, and one may rather take up Scullard's general verdict on Augustus. The Emperor, in his view, accumulated and held powers which 'together with his personal *auctoritas*, raised the First Citizen far above the level of a magistrate and made him in effect, though not in law, a constitutional monarch' (p. 226). A paradoxical statement, if not a contradiction in terms, with a smack of Dio Cassius—and Tacitus had another word for it! The sense, however, is clear, and the implications were worth stressing more strongly throughout the account, following Syme in this respect. Certainly during the last part of his reign Augustus set the Principate to harden in a dynastic mould that limited freedom and secured succession for his family. There is nothing inconsistent between the early hopes of Virgil, Horace, and Livy on the one hand and the later anger of Tacitus on the other: the former might expect better things, the latter looked back on the worse. Indeed, for all Augustus' services to the State—and we shall not miss them in this book—he began as a Republican dynast and ended as Emperor, and there seems little reason to suppose that he would ever have considered seriously relaxing his grip on the State. In any event, his ambition as well as a sense of responsibility—not necessarily incompatible—may be ranked among the qualities which matched the desperate needs of his day.

If the accession of Tiberius in fact confirmed the dynastic character of the Principate, it was historically a dramatic event, and we may follow Tacitus—now in the light of Syme's *Tacitus*—in treating it emphatically. Tacitus' study in hypocrisy exaggerates a mixture of genuine hesitation and conventional reluctance, and Scullard sets the circumstances in order; but he has perhaps played down unduly the effect upon Tiberius of the unrest in the northern armies and the position of Germanicus. He then proceeds with a sound description of the period, particularly in reference to the government of the Empire. We miss something of the atmosphere in which the grim soldier, distrusting politicians, handled the Senate, struggled with treason trials, controlled the elder Agrippina, and was deceived by Sejanus. But it does not hurt then to have Gaius' dynastic irresponsibility reduced to a plain statement, whether or not he dreamed of full god-monarchy; and Claudius is well portrayed as an imperial ruler before he is discussed as a man afflicted with court intrigue. Note the treatment of Claudius' administrative developments, his religious policy (e.g. towards the Alexandrine Jews), and the conquest of Britain. Nero moves inevitably to his fall amidst developments on the frontiers and in the provinces, and Scullard might have stressed more significantly as an imperial issue the relations of the armies with the Emperor through whose destruction they brought down the Julio-Claudian house.

But the chief interest throughout the book is the state of the Roman world, and it closes with a full review of the economic and social life and the culture of the Early Empire. Scullard describes the expansion of industry, trade, and commerce within the Empire and of commerce beyond its frontiers, and relates these economic factors to provincial urbanization and the emergence of a new senatorial nobility. The scene is one of increasing prosperity; but he notes the obstacles to progress, for example in difficulties of transport and in the limiting effect of slave labour, as well as in the serious drain of precious metals to the East, and he points to the signs of provincial competition with Italy. What lay ahead of Roman civilization is suggested more positively in his appreciation of the Eastern cults, Judaism, and Christianity—with a word on

the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Shrine of St. Peter—as he looks forward from the Neronian Persecution to the day when Constantine would sit on the throne of the Caesars.

Clare College, Cambridge

A. H. McDONALD

THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

GEORGE SARTON: *A History of Science. Vol. 2: Hellenistic Science and Culture in the last three centuries B.C.* Pp. xxxvi+554; 112 figs. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 63s. net.

MORRIS R. COHEN and I. E. DRABKIN: *A Source Book in Greek Science.* Pp. xxi+ 581; 120 figs. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 6os. net.

GEORGE SARTON, to whom historians of science owe so great a debt, planned *Hellenistic Science and Culture in the last three centuries B.C.* as the second volume of eight that were intended to cover the history of science up to the present day. This magnificent project will have to be continued by others, for Sarton died in 1956. Volume 1, *Ancient Science through the Golden Age of Greece*, was reviewed in *C.R.* v (1955), 196.

In his preface to the present volume Sarton reminds us of his audience: 'I am writing for historians of science, or, more generally, for men of science who are anxious to know the origins of their knowledge and of the amenities and privileges of their social life. . . . My book is not addressed so much to philologists as to people whose training was (like my own) scientific. Hence I must add bits of opinion that would be superfluous to philologists. . . . As far as scientific matters are concerned, I try to say enough to refresh the reader's memory but do not attempt to provide complete explanations, which would be equally unbearable to those who know and to those who don't.'

This means that for classical students some parts of the book, more especially those dealing with mathematics, are hard to follow. However, most of the information with which the book abounds is clearly and agreeably presented; and much of it, moreover, is information which could only be gathered laboriously from other sources, if at all. For instance, the section on contagious diseases on p. 410 is quite outside the normal range. Above all, the book has the comprehensiveness that the period demands. Greek and Chaldaean astronomy, Greek and Roman technology are skilfully interwoven. Hebrew thought and literature are related to the age, and oriental superstitions make their presence felt to complicate the picture, and also to complete it. At the centre are the Museum and Library of Alexandria; and of the Library in particular Sarton, a distinguished bibliographer, has written with both discretion and imagination. Bibliography, indeed, plays an important part throughout. The later history of many ideas and many texts is fully described, and one of the most attractive features of this volume, as of its predecessor, is the large number of reproductions of pages from old printed editions.

Classical students are handsomely provided with a wide variety of sound information on scientific matters. But are scientists equally well served with reliable information on the classical background of the period? Unfortunately

not. We are told that Sarton, at the time of his death, had checked and revised the typescript. This may have been the case so far as the scientific and bibliographical material was concerned, but it is hard to believe that it was altogether true of the rest. There are numerous mistakes in the spelling of Greek and Roman proper names and of Greek words; and it is disconcerting to find passages from Lucretius printed as prose, and elsewhere verses quoted in forms that will not scan. The book thus presents an uneven appearance. Pages 514–16, from a chapter on art, will serve as an example. First we find Enos (for Eros) in a footnote; and then an excellent paragraph on Pasiteles, with the stimulating remark that his treatise on art (not Greek art) was the last in antiquity to be written by a professional artist. Later comes an interesting reference to the art dealer Avianus Evander (but he is called Avianus); and turning the page, we read that the basilicas of Rome ‘were transformed into Christian churches’. This last statement is one of many that surprise us, but may do so ultimately for our good. If a student, mistrusting such a statement, consults Platner and Ashby, and finds that only one basilica in Rome is known, at a late date and in exceptional circumstances, to have been dedicated as a church, and that to this extent Mau’s remark in P.–W. that ‘the conversion of public basilicas into churches cannot be proved’ is an overstatement, something is gained. And if we are informed that in Ovid ‘Alexandrianism reappeared . . . in its most exaggerated form’, we are at least bound to ask ourselves what we mean by Alexandrianism. Some of these debatable ideas might perhaps have been modified if there had been more time for consultation. As for the literature of the period, we miss the enthusiasm that Sarton shows for Homer or the insight that he brings to bear on Herodotus in his first volume. This is not at all surprising. At the same time, it is a pity that his treatment of Theocritus, Catullus, and Horace is so perfunctory and erratic. Lucretius and the *Georgics* in virtue of their subject-matter fare better, and so too do prose writers in general. Cicero is treated with respect (but why is he called a Stoic moralist?), and Varro, who was a man after Sarton’s own heart, is warmly acclaimed.

To revise all of Sarton’s doubtful, but stimulating, interpretations would be undesirable, even if it were possible to do so. The numerous spelling mistakes and factual errors should, however, be eliminated before a second edition appears. The author deserves no less. Until this is done, classical students will gain almost as much from the book as scientists, and will stand to lose less from the risk of being misled. This is hardly what Sarton intended. We may end appropriately by quoting Sarton’s comment on the work of Carl Müller: ‘The errors should be corrected, but without self-conceit and ingratititude.’

A Source Book in Greek Science, which first appeared in 1948, is now reprinted with no changes except that printing errors have been corrected, a few notes have been added, and the list of books and articles has been brought up to date. In a sense, this collection is complementary to Sarton’s work and was, indeed, highly appreciated by him. There are no Greek texts, but the English translations are reputable and only a few are out of date, such as Bostock and Riley’s version of Pliny, which was, however, still the only possible choice at the time when the book was being prepared. There is only limited space for notes; and some of the texts, for example those on petrography, mean very little as they stand, but for the most part the guidance given is adequate, at least for a start, and in some matters, geometry and astronomy for example, it is generous. Here, as in Sarton’s work, we find a wealth of material which

could otherwise be collected only after much investigation. The book is probably too expensive to be prescribed as a text for undergraduates in this country. That, in these times, is regrettable. Advanced students and teachers will find that it has much to offer them.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS

1. E. C. KENNEDY and BERTHA TILLEY: *Trojan Aeneas*. Pp. xxi + 135; 8 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. Cloth, 6s.
2. C. G. COOPER: *Journey to Hesperia*. Pp. lxii + 189; 16 plates. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
3. R. ROEBUCK: Cornelius Nepos, *Three Lives (Alcibiades, Dion, Atticus)*. Pp. vi + 138; 8 plates. London: Bell, 1958. Cloth, 5s.
4. E. C. KENNEDY: Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* iii. Pp. 107: 1 plate, 2 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. Cloth, 6s.
5. E. C. KENNEDY: Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* vii. Pp. 224: 1 plate, 4 maps and plans. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. Cloth, 6s.

(1) consists of selections from *Aeneid* i–iii (mainly from ii), telling the story of Aeneas. It has workmanlike notes and vocabulary, and an appendix with longer notes for teachers. A useful introduction to Virgil for those who prefer snippets to continuous passages. (2) is edited by the Professor of Classics at the University of Queensland. It has selections from *Aeneid* i–iv (753 lines in all), the usual account of Virgil's life (how many more ways are there of rephrasing it?), and an extended discussion of metre, dealing especially with syllable-division, to which the editor attaches great importance for the correct reading of Latin verse. A useful introduction again for 'snippeteers'. (3) is a useful book for junior forms; there are good plates and a short historical introduction. (4) and (5) have the same introduction, dealing with historical background and the Roman army. The notes are full, and the two books are particularly commendable for the excellence of typography and presentation.

6. R. C. REEVES: *Horrenda*. Pp. 159; drawings. Slough: Centaur Books, 1958. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
7. G. S. THOMPSON and C. H. CRADDOCK: *Latin. A Four Year Course to G.C.E. Ordinary Level*: Book i. Pp. xi + 218: 5 maps. London and Glasgow: Blackie. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
8. S. K. BAILEY: *Roman Life and Letters. A Reader for the Sixth Form*. Pp. x + 195; 7 plates. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

(6) is a reader, designed for pre-O- and O-Level years, consisting of extracts dealing with crime and the supernatural, and illustrated with comic drawings. The reviewer doubts if this is really the best way to commend Latin studies to the young. (7) introduces yet another Latin course, which is designed to take the student to O Level in four years, with four books. This first book contains 33 lessons, and follows the normal modern pattern; there are, however,

continuous passages of English prose for translation from the start, and interesting illustrations, and a teacher looking for a new course might well consider it. (8) is designed for first-year classical sixth-formers and non-specialists who want to keep up Latin in the sixth. It is really a glorified unseen book, with notes and vocabulary, the passages being grouped in sections—e.g. Amusements, The Young Roman, Religion. There is a good deal of Horace and Pliny.

9. S. K. BAILEY: *Examination Papers in Latin*. Pp. 87. London: Macmillan, 1958. Cloth, 3s.
10. S. MORRIS: *Advanced Latin Tests*. Pp. 141. London: Harrap, 1959. Cloth, 6s.

(9) contains examination papers for O Level based on N.U.J.M.B. Part i has 20 papers for the pre-O year; Part ii has 40 papers for O year. Good value for the money. (10) is for A and S Level specialists, and contains 100 unseens, 50 proses, and questions on syntax and history. Half the unseens are taken from medieval and modern Latinists, including Poggio, Erasmus, Guthrie (on Eisenhower), and Higham. Again, very good value.

11. A. H. NASH-WILLIAMS, *Advanced Greek Prose Composition*. Pp. xvii + 177. London: Macmillan, 1957. Cloth, 6s.
12. A. H. NASH-WILLIAMS: *Key to Advanced Level Greek Prose Composition*. Pp. 69. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

(11) and (12) are in continuation of the author's *Introduction to Continuous Greek Prose*. (11) has useful discussions of such subjects as Abstract Nouns, Adjectives, Dialogue, etc. It has 90 exercises, and in addition 40 A-Level examination proses; and there is a vocabulary.

13. R. R. SELLMAN: *Roman Britain*. Pp. 67; maps and drawings. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 8s 6d.

(13) is copiously illustrated by very good maps and plans (at least one to each page), and provides a first-class introduction. The author brings his story up to the beginnings of Saxon settlement.

Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Blackburn

B. H. KEMBALL-COOK

SHORT REVIEWS

HJALMAR FRISK: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Lieferung 7: pp. 577–672; Lieferung 8: pp. 673–768. Heidelberg: Winter, 1958–9. Paper, DM 8.60 each.

WITH his eighth fascicule Frisk reaches *καλύπτω*. About the work as a whole there is nothing to add to what has been said in reviews of earlier fascicles. As before, it is

interesting to note those observations which reveal the author's opinion of (and something of his feeling towards) questions of linguistic method and controversial aspects of Indo-European studies. For example, under **H₂pa* there is a brief and salutary reaffirmation of a principle universally held and yet too often flouted: 'Eigentliche Bedeutung unbekannt, mitthin ohne Etymologie.'

έρεός: '**Ereoklῆs* is given, but not Myc. *e-le-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo*. *έύς*: Schwyzer's view of

έάων is given, but not the simpler possibility that it is gen. pl. of a substantive **wesw-ā* (O. Irish *fēb*, quoted by Frisk) or, since it shows no trace of *-r-*, of a similarly formed **esw-ā*. ζέω, ζνύω: Mycenaean forms are omitted. ηέριος, ηρε: can **āfepi(os)*, which these presuppose, owe its long initial vowel to metrical lengthening rather than to I.E. vowel-gradation? ηίκος, ηλεξ: there is no mention of the view developed by O. Szemerédy, *Word*, vii (1952), 48. θάκος: Frisk supports the view that *ā*, not *ε*, is the phonetically regular weak grade of I.E. *ē*; cf. s.v. θάρα. This view suits some etymologies very well, but involves him in difficulties with others, e.g., s.v. θέός, 'Der quantitative Unterschied *ē*: *ē* bleibt noch zu erklären.' Θησεύς: no mention is made of Myc. *te-se-u* or of L. R. Palmer's discussion of personal names in -*eū* (including this), *Eranos*, liv (1956), 7-10. θρίσται: meaning, phonetic development, and chronology are on the whole against taking this as a doublet (even by metrical licence) of θερίσται. The derivative ἀπόθριμα is omitted. θρόνος: Myc. *ta-no* is not quoted, though *ta-ra-na* is given with a question mark s.v. θράνος. ί: despite the numerous grammatical authorities cited in Kühner-Blass, i. 595 f., it is hard to believe in the existence of this word in Attic; pronouns are an unlikely class of vocabulary to provide *άπαξ λεγόμενα* in a well-preserved dialect and author (contrast the case of *ī* in a Cyprian gloss). Frisk does not discuss the length of the vowel, short according to Apollonius, *de Pron.* 71, but long in the Sophocles fragment and, if there read, *Il.* xxiv. 608. ίλη: Frisk finds difficulty in the phonetic development if from **fu-fād*; is a solution possible on the lines of *είρηματ*, etc. (Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*², § 167)? ιονθός: this word, with its Germanic and Slavic cognates, denotes facial hair; for the Mid. Irish *fēs*, find Frisk gives 'Haupthaar'. But in Mod. Irish (and, I believe, earlier) these words and their derivatives usually denote the beard, hair on the face or body, or the fur of animals, rarely the hair of the head (*find* also a single hair); the Irish members of this word-family thus agree in meaning with those of the other languages. ίννος: Myc. *i-qo*, notwithstanding the ideograms and association with *po-ro*, *o-no* on K. Ca 895, receives a special award of two question marks; *i-qi-ja-* is not mentioned.

Misprints are, as usual, few and trifling: s.v. άψω: for *άφαντος* read *άψω*; s.v. ήμεις: insert aind. before *άδιν*; s.v. θρίσται: for (gewöhnlich) *άπαξ-θερίσται* read *-θρίσται*.

BRUNO SNELL: *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Editio tertia. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pars i: *Epinicia*. Pp. xi + 190. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth, DM 7.80.

THE publisher's call for a third edition of Snell's Pindar coincided with information from Lobel that many new fragments would appear in a future number of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Snell therefore decided to divide the book into two parts, issuing the *Epinicia* at once as Part i, but reserving the Fragments till he could embody this new material.

The changes in this Part i are very slight. The list of Papyri is now confined to the three concerned with the *Epinicia*, and the Metrorum Conspectus and Indexes, as before, will follow the Fragments. In the Preface a few references to publications since 1955 are added, and two omissions from the selected list of editions (Aldus and Farnell) have been supplied. Changes in the body of the volume are difficult to detect. In the text I have noticed only two: in *P.* 4. 15 Snell adopts Barrett's *μελησαμβρώτων*, and in *I.* 8. 32 he restores the manuscript *είνεκεν*. There are rather more changes in the app. crit. (see *O.* 10. 9, *P.* 2. 85, where he now omits Schadewaldt's *ναρέωθ*, *P.* 10. 70, *I.* 6. 36, *I.* 8. ult.). Most of these justify their mention, especially Von der Mühl's *γάμους* or *γάμους* in *I.* 6. 36, but the meaning of *χαλκῆ*, proposed by Erbse in *I.* 8. ult., is obscure to me.

A few trivial faults survive from earlier editions. There is still a false full stop in *P.* 6. 48 (but the opposite slip in *N.* 7. 73 has been corrected); Fennell's name is misspelt on p. 146, and the countless mentions of E. Schmid include one 'E. Schmidt' (p. 157); and there is still an omission in the contents of B listed on p. viii.

D. S. ROBERTSON
Trinity College, Cambridge

SIGRID KAUSER: *Die Geburt der Athena im altgriechischen Epos*. Pp. 63. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1959. Paper, DM 4.80.

THE birth of Athena is described in two 'Epic' sources: Hesiod, *Theog.* 886 ff., and a dactylic hexameter passage quoted by Chrysippus ap. Galen (*Stoic. Frr.* ii. 256 von Armin). The author discusses each in turn, with notes on text and interpretation; then compares the two, and shows (with help from the context in which Chrysippus quotes

his extract) that the second is not dependent on, or even directly connected with, the first. The Chrysippus fragment, though presumably composed later than the *Theogony*, represents with greater fidelity an old story which has been considerably distorted by the requirements of the context in the *Theogony*. So far the argument appears convincing: the version given by the Chrysippus fragment is evidently the more archaic, and the superior in quality; the story behind it is amplified with the help of other sources, especially the *Hymn to Apollo* 305 ff. A brief concluding section considers, with all proper caution, the possibility of an Orphic source for the Chrysippus fragment.

The essay is clear in expression and sober in judgement. Its primary purpose is achieved, and it would now be all the more interesting to know when the Chrysippus poem was composed. The textual and linguistic commentary offered here, though conscientious and helpful, says by no means the last word.

D. L. PAGE

Jesus College, Cambridge

HOLGER FRIIS JOHANSEN: *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis. A Study of Form.* Pp. 198. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959. Paper, Kr. 30.

This is a study of certain types of statement occurring in the iambic passages of tragedy which contain or imply a generalization. The greater part of the book is devoted to three main types; the *comparatio paratactica* in which the juxtaposition of two statements suggests a reflection appropriate to the context, e.g. *Soph.* 602 ff.; the *παράδειγμα οἰκεῖον*, the most important class, when the truth of a generalization is illustrated by something in the dramatic situation, as when Atossa illustrates the effects of experience in misery by describing her own apprehensive state of mind, *Pers.* 598 ff.; and third, not always easily distinguishable from the last, the Descriptive Application, which consists in showing that a generalization is applicable to the existing situation; thus in the *agon* of the *Phoenissae* Polyneices opens with an application of the generalization that the truth needs only a simple plea, 469 ff., and Eteocles answers with a paradigmatic opening of which the starting point is the ambiguity of language, 499 ff. Other types of general reflection are briefly considered, and a chapter is devoted to generalization in tragic lyrics. In each case some account is given of earlier uses of the type, and there is

a considerable amount of discussion of the textual problems in the passages referred to.

These passages are considered, in their formal aspect, in great detail. Johansen examines their balance and symmetry, the sharpness of their articulation, the ways in which the transition is effected from the generalization to the main theme. Though some new truths are doubtless established, it cannot be said that much of interest emerges from all this. An effort is made to relate formal developments to the style of the tragic poets and to the chronology of their plays. But the number of instances is too small for the use of statistical methods. *Comparatio paratactica* is obviously the mark of a somewhat archaic style, and the more elaborate examples are confined to Aeschylus and to the *Ajax* and *Antigone*, though *O.C.* 607 ff. is a late specimen; fourteen examples are found in Euripides, most of them short and thus easily quotable, which explains why half of them are from the fragments. Paradigmatic passages tend in Sophocles to be merged by smooth transitions with the speeches of which they are part, while Euripides keeps the articulation clear, but in his later plays he is readier to make a rather incidental use of the figure at minor turns of the action and no longer in connexion with the crucial points. Descriptive Application is rather less important than *παράδειγμα*, with twenty-nine occurrences in tragedy against thirty-seven. In Aeschylus general and particular are less clearly distinguished than in paradigmatic comparisons, and they are found in less important contexts. Sophocles, with a growing distaste for generalization, virtually abandoned Descriptive Application in his later work except for *Phil.* 1316 ff. Euripides has three instances in *Medea* and two in *Hippolytus*, nowhere else more than one; this too may reflect a diminishing interest in generalization for its own sake. In fact it is doubtful whether the subject can support a book of this length, especially as the approach is purely formal and no attempt is made to explore the psychological impulse which led to the peculiarly Greek use of generalization in argument or to illustrate it from the orators.

The book is written in adequate English, though being concerned with distinctions based on hardly perceptible differences it cannot offer easy reading. But the word 'pathos' is used throughout in a technical sense which it does not normally bear in English.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

DAVID GRENE and RICHMOND LATTIMORE (editors): *The Complete Greek Tragedies*. Vol. iii: *Hecuba* translated by WILLIAM ARROWSMITH; *Andromache* by JOHN FREDERICK NIMS; *Trojan Women* by RICHMOND LATTIMORE, *Ion* by RONALD FREDERICK WILLETS. Vol. iv: *Rhesus* translated by RICHMOND LATTIMORE, *Suppliant Women* by FRANK JONES, *Orestes* by WILLIAM ARROWSMITH, *Iphigenia in Aulis* by CHARLES R. WALKER. Pp. 255, 307. Chicago, University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1958, 1959. Cloth, 30s. net each.

Now that the third and fourth volumes of Euripides have appeared there remain only three more plays to be translated before the *Complete Greek Tragedies* become an accomplished fact. One half of the eight plays in these volumes are from the hands of translators whose work has not previously been seen in this series. Professor Nims, making a little free with a remark in the *Περὶ Ύψους* about the 'colloquial' diction of Euripides, has produced a version of the *Andromache* which is on the verge of the slangy; but he infuses surprising life and vigour into a play which, after all, is largely a slanging match. Mr. Willets's *Ion* has more of conventional dignity but does not lack flexibility, and Professor Jones's *Suppliants* is sober work, free from false modernisms. Mr. Walker's economical *Iphigenia in Aulis* gives the impression that it might act effectively.

The plays are introduced by notes of varying length and complexity. Nims is content to see in the lack of structure in the *Andromache* a reflection of a chaotic age. Willets feels that the *Ion* cannot be taken at its face value and looks for a rationalistic explanation easier to swallow than Verrall's. Professor Arrowsmith takes an unduly severe view of the efforts of Orestes and his companions in misfortune to save their worthless lives.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

Menandri quae supersunt: Pars altera: *Reliquiae apud veteres scriptores servatae*. Edidit A. KÖRTE: opus postumum retractavit, addenda ad utramque partem adiecit A. THIERFELDER.

Editio altera aucta et correcta. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xvi+398. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth, DM 16.60.

THIERFELDER's invaluable revision of Körte's second volume appeared in 1953, and was reviewed in this journal by the late A. W. Gomme (n.s. v [1955], 148). Now it is out of print; and as the book is urgently needed, all the more so on account of its excellent index of words, Thierfelder has sensibly issued a reprint with a few additions and corrections without waiting for the *Dyskolas*.

A glance through the Addenda (particularly those to part ii) will show the reader what is new. Four fragments are added. 317a is the one found by A. Colonna in the Nicander commentary at P. Oxy. 2221 col. i. 15 (where it is not quite certain that anything but the word σκύλα or σκύλα should be credited to Menander). 669a is the fragment acutely discovered by T. B. L. Webster in the text of Cassius Dio lx. 29. 715a is from the *Lexicon Vaticanum*, s.v. ἀκεμήν. I cannot believe that Menander, even at his most tragic, ever wrote ἐνοκευδέρο: ἐνοκευάρο is virtually certain. 871a is from the *Philetaerus*, newly edited by A. Dain, s.v. λάγυος. Mr. W. G. Arnott has ingeniously explained τῆς σκύλας in fr. 667 (see p. 298); but I am not sure that the lacuna he postulates is necessary.

The book contains many references to modern secondary sources. Much of this material is useful, and it may seem ungrateful to cavil at its presence; but I wonder whether a standard plain text is the better for a load of this sort. The reader is not greatly helped by continually being referred to attempts to reconstruct lost plays from a few scattered quotations; nor should the editor seem to invest such attempts with his authority. Once in a way this sort of thing is worth while; but anyone who doubts that it is for the most part waste of time had better compare with the actual plot of the *Dyskolas* any of the various attempts made earlier to reconstruct it.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES
Christ Church, Oxford

E. V. RIEU: Apollonius of Rhodes, *The Voyage of Argo*. A new translation. Pp. 207. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1959. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

At a time when the study of the classical languages is receding the translation of classical texts is a necessary but hopeless task. For in the rendering of an 'artistic' text

(whether it be poetry or prose) accuracy of meaning, which is possible, has to be combined with accuracy of 'feeling', and this is impossible, as the emotional content of words and rhythms differs widely from language to language. It is salutary to remember that not only the 'feeling' of some words with the same meaning, but the feeling of all words with the same meaning differs greatly in every language. Words as common and as simple as θάρασ or ηλιος have a very different emotional content in Greek from their equivalents in *any* modern language. Christian 'death' is very different from 'pagan' death, and the modern sun (a heavenly body, from which . . . etc.) is not the sun of the ancient Greeks. The translator of every classical text is therefore faced with an impossible task; he is embarking on a battle lost before it has been joined.

Perhaps in no other field of classical studies are the problems of translation so pronounced as in Alexandrian poetry, whose complex and erudite style (determined by, yet fighting shy of, the great Greek classical poetic heritage) is often difficult to grasp even in the original. Dr. Rieu, an experienced and successful translator of the Greek epics, has once again made a noble effort in his rendering of the *Argonautica*. He has wisely abandoned any attempt to present in modern terms the feeling of Alexandrian poetry in general, and of the special style of Apollonius in particular. He gives a clear, pleasing, and unpretentious prose translation of the voyage of the Argo and Jason's adventures. He treats Apollonius more as a 'novelist' than as an epic poet. And wisely so; for there is no living narrative poetry today on which to mould a verse translation of the *Argonautica*. The modern world has no patience and no feeling for the epic, and for that reason Kazantzakis's modern *Odyssey* is not really successful. It is different with lyric and dramatic poetry, which are still alive in the Western world, and there the translators of the classics can be greatly helped by contemporary works. Not only the general public, but a number of specialists will be grateful to Dr. Rieu for his sensible and lucid prose version of a text that is still full of dark and unsolved problems (on the difficulties of our extant texts see Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, vol. ii, pp. 165 f.). It is a pity that this translation appeared before the new edition of the *Argonautica* by H. Fraenkel.

In a long and interesting introduction Dr. Rieu examines the life and poetry of Apollonius. To what he tells us about the connexion of the poet Callimachus and the differences between the first and the second

version of the *Argonautica* should be added all that R. Pfeiffer has brought to light in his great edition of Callimachus (vol. ii, p. xli, and vol. i, *passim*). There is no doubt that Dr. Rieu over-estimates the poetic achievement of Apollonius. Book iii of the *Argonautica* may be the greatest example of the psychological treatment of love handed down from antiquity (it is fair not to compare Idyll ii of Theocritus on account of its length, though it is much finer from a literary point of view), and the influence of Apollonius on Virgil, and through Virgil on the whole of Western literature, may have been outstanding. But the narrative still remains uneven and episodic, and the main characters inconsistent—Medea of book iii is not the Medea of book iv—or painfully ineffective; perhaps no hero in the whole of great literature cuts as lamentable a figure as Jason.

A brief glossary at the end of the book explains the more important persons and places, but in a text as 'erudite' as the *Argonautica* it is bound to be insufficient. A full commentary would be necessary, and that is beyond the scope of the Penguin series.

Exeter College, Oxford C. A. TRY PANIS

HEINRICH QUIRING: *Heraklit*. Pp. 164. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1959. Cloth, DM 18.

THE present book is one of at least four wholly devoted to Heraclitus which were published by different authors in 1959. It is written from the point of view of a modern physicist whose incursion into classical studies began when he looked at a number of translations of the fragments and discovered with surprise that they were obviously wrong. As a result, the work before us, which consists of an introduction, Greek text of the fragments with German translation, footnotes, bibliography, and indexes. The author does not know of the publication of Kirk's *Heraclitus* in 1954, still less of subsequent discussions, and the book cannot be regarded as a serious contribution to the study of Heraclitus. The substantial introduction (pp. 9-48) is entitled 'Heraklit im Urteil der Nachwelt', but it is not concerned with subsequent judgements about Heraclitus. It is rather an attempt to show how the work of later chemists, physicists, and philosophers has led them, despite their different starting-points, to make statements about life, temperature, matter, energy, change, motion, rest, and similar questions which are

apparently similar to statements attributed to Heraclitus. Some of these similarities are wildly fanciful, as when fr. 30 with Simplicius in A 10 is called the 'Entropy-sentence' and is interpreted as meaning 'Entropy (= Fire) is the measure of Disorder'. In other cases the similarity is trivial or superficial. Only a fundamental discussion of Heraclitus' doctrines could conceivably establish anything else. It is not attempted here and of course in fact it would inevitably show that most of the similarities are merely verbal.

The fragments are reclassified upon a new principle of grouping, without reference to any standard system of numeration. Texts that are placed together in Diels-Kranz are broken up into separate fragments and then interpreted in isolation. This is exactly the reverse of what is needed, and the result is that what are probably different versions of the same fragment, together with Stoic and other later interpretations and adaptations, are all treated as of equal value and authority. The plain if unpalatable truth concerning Heraclitus is that nothing less than the full apparatus of scholarship will suffice for any serious attempt at interpretation. This is even more certain in the case of any attempt at reinterpretation, which is what is undertaken here.

G. B. KERFERD

University College, Swansea

ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Flavius Josephus, *Autobiographie*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xxvi + 79. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper, 7.50 Fr.

The new Budé edition of Josephus, *Vita*, is competent and scholarly but unambitious. The editor has adopted with little change Thackeray's text, and provides a very meagre apparatus criticus, and brief notes, mainly topographical. The introduction has nothing new to say on Josephus himself, or the chronology of his writings, but summarizes the state of the question clearly. The most useful feature is the bibliography, which brings up to date that of Schürer (1901).

A. H. M. JONES

Jesus College, Cambridge

B. L. HIJMAN: *Ἄσκησις, Notes on Epictetus' Educational System*. Pp. 109. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1959. Cloth, fl. 12.50.

This study, which is published under the auspices of the Philosophical Institute of the University of Utrecht, is concerned with the theoretic basis, such as it is, of Epictetus' doctrine of Askesis, and with the way in which he attempted to give practical effect to his doctrine through particular exercises. It is supported by brief and rather perfunctory discussions of Epictetus' life and personality, his methods of teaching, and the history of Askesis before Aristotle. The much more important period from Aristotle onwards is omitted, apparently because it has seen been dealt with by others. But it is surely important for an understanding of Epictetus, and in particular one would have liked to see a discussion on the theoretic side of the Aristotelian doctrine of Ethikos in comparison with the doctrine of Askesis.

The theoretic basis of Askesis in Epictetus turns out to be rather slender, though Hijmans does what can be done to relate it to his general ethical position. The trouble is, as he justly remarks, that Epictetus' teaching lacks the sting of independent reflection on ethics, and he was not interested even to 'remeditate' old problems. Even so, rather more could be done by a fuller discussion to distinguish what may be specific to Epictetus in doctrine or sentiment and what is simply the common stock of Stoic doctrine or is due to his teacher Musonius Rufus. This applies in particular to such topics as Epictetus' theology, and the Roman elements in his thought, topics which are raised but not pursued very far. The most interesting part of the study is concerned with examples of particular exercises—we might almost call them spiritual exercises, and Hijmans calls them *examen conscientiae*—which give us a clear and effective picture of what Epictetus must have been like as a man and as a teacher. The book is very clearly and pleasantly printed, though there are a number of corrections needed in the Greek.

G. B. KERFERD

University College, Swansea

J. C. OPSTELTEN: *Beschouwigen naar aanleiding van het ontbreken van ons ethisch wilsbegrip in de oud-griekse ethiek*. Pp. 66. Amsterdam; North Holland Publishing Co., 1959. Paper, fl. 4.

THE author, who of late has turned his attention from Sophocles to Plato, now contributes to the *Mededeelingen* of the Royal Netherlands Academy (N.R., Deel 22, No. 1)

a short but nowise negligible study of the curious question why classical Greek ethics have no word for 'will' in the moral sense, which he provisionally defines (p. 7, n. 1) as 'a conscious effort to which our intelligence has given its sanction, or at least not withheld it'. He first examines the surviving literature for quasi-equivalents, and is of opinion (pp. 14 ff.) that the nearest is the Platonic *θύμοισθεῖς*. Attention is also paid to the claims of the Aristotelian *προαιρέως* (see especially pp. 14, 20; add to the author's references that W. C. Greene, *Moira*, p. 327, nearly identifies it with will). Passing to a later date, he notes (p. 29) that the conception, and a word for it, make their appearance in the first century A.D. in Seneca (*epp.* 80. 4 and elsewhere) and in St. Paul (especially *Rom.* vii. 15-20), although there are adumbrations of it in the last century of the Republic. He suggests (p. 30) that the origin of the idea may be looked for in Cynic *διαρρήβατ*. Thence he proceeds to examine later writers, above all St. Augustine, and to account for the change as due (pp. 38 ff.) to the passage from a static and intellectualist view of the universe and the moral world to a dynamic one, characteristic especially of Christian ethics, with an interesting discussion of which the essay ends (pp. 48 ff.). His final problem is (p. 59) whether a synthesis of the two attitudes is possible.

St. Andrews

H. J. Rose

A. H. R. E. PAAP: *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.: the Sources and Some Deductions.* (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, vol. viii.) Pp. 127. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Paper, fl. 40.

MANY of the conclusions of Ludwig Traube's *Nomina Sacra* are still beyond dispute, but his theory of the origin of *nomina sacra* came under fire almost immediately: in 1910, G. Rudberg maintained that this practice was ultimately derived not, *pae* Traube, from imitation of the Hebrew tetragrammaton by Jews translating the Tora into Greek, but from the kind of contraction found in ostraca, and E. Nachmanson, finding that inscriptions corroborated this view, concluded that contraction of *nomina sacra* had developed naturally from Greek cursive. Rudberg's theory was based on ostraca alone, Nachmanson's on inscriptions, while Traube had less than forty papyri at his disposal; Professor Paap now presents an analysis of the

relevant Greek papyrus texts which have appeared since 1907, as well as of those of Traube's of which he has seen a transcription—421 texts in all. These texts are set out in chronological order, showing how the fifteen conventional *nomina sacra* are written in their sacred and profane sense in each text; the results for each word are then listed and analysed separately, the theories hitherto held reviewed in the light of the new evidence, and the author's conclusions stated.

Paap's earliest example of a contracted *nomen sacrum* comes from the first half of the second century A.D. The practice cannot then be placed before c. A.D. 100 at the earliest, and seems to have been limited at first to a small, 'original' group of four words, *θεός*, *κύριος*, *Ιησοῦς*, and *Χριστός*, to which *πνεῦμα* and *πατήρ* were soon added. As only one of these, *πατήρ*, is in the group of six which Traube believed to have been contracted in pre-Christian times, considerable doubt is thrown on his theory of the Jewish origin and use of *nomina sacra*, since it is scarcely possible that Christians deliberately refrained from perpetuating these contractions merely in order not to imitate Jews. However, even in these early stages there was no rigid procedure—*nomina sacra* were often treated as *profana* and vice versa—and, as the practice was extended to other nouns, inconsistencies became more and more marked. Even the biblical texts suggest that there were in fact no strict rules, unless they were honoured more in the breach than the observance, and, if Paap is right, the practice of contracting *nomina sacra* developed most haphazardly. He argues that it began with imitation of the Hebrew tetragrammaton by Jews in the early Christian communities outside Palestine, not by pre-Christian Jews; beginning with *θεός*, the practice spread to other words of spiritual significance to Christians, but the original principle of contraction borrowed from Hebrew, the omission of vowels, was forgotten, and instead letters between the first and last were omitted; the next step was to distinguish these contractions by using a horizontal stroke above the word as in numerals, but later the original purpose of this was also forgotten and the stroke itself thought to give spiritual significance, being used with *nomina sacra* and *profana* written in full.

This adaptation of Traube's view is the most sensible yet advanced, and it has the merit of placing the origin of *nomina sacra* in the most likely period—that which saw the expansion of the early Church and the attendant need of biblical texts in Greek.

But the evidence on which it is based is still fragmentary and selective; perhaps not enough stress is laid upon this point or upon the different value of biblical texts and Christian letters as evidence. In fact, Paap is guilty of a methodological error when he fails to state explicitly the criteria employed in selecting his 'Christian' letters: those who are familiar with papyrus letters know how inconsistent they are in their abbreviations and how dangerous it would be to classify as Christian those letters which use *nomina sacra* and as pagan those which treat them as *profana*; yet even the latter have evidence, at least of a negative kind, to offer.

An index of all papyri cited, with full titles of the volumes in which they appeared, would have been most useful, and that not only to the amateur of papyrology, especially as Paap's abbreviations are not always self-explanatory.

B. R. REES

University College, Cardiff

KURT WEITZMANN: *Ancient Book Illumination*. (Martin Classical Lectures, 16.) Pp. xiv+166; 64 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 72s. net.

In the preface to this volume containing his Martin Classical Lectures Professor Kurt Weitzmann acknowledges that his aim for the moment is to provide no more than an outline of the history of classical book illumination, and that the primary material for such a study is almost non-existent owing to the perishable nature of papyrus. It must, therefore, be stressed at the outset that his main hypothesis, already adumbrated in his book *Illustrations in Roll and Codex*, rests very largely upon a comparative examination of purely secondary evidence, since the enthusiasm and ingenuity with which he erects this hypothesis into an imposing edifice might well delude an unwary reader into forgetting the frailty of its foundations.

Beginning with scientific and didactic treatises, Weitzmann seeks to establish that there was a distinctive 'papyrus style' of illumination, which inserted miniatures in the text as required; that, as one moves from scientific to didactic texts, so those insets tend to become less diagrammatic and more artistic; that the similarities in style and composition between earlier and later illustrations of the same text and between illustrations of different texts point to their having been derived from common 'archetypes' and

having followed 'stemmata' quite independent of those of the texts themselves; and that illustrated papyrus rolls, if they had survived, would have revealed those 'archetypes'. Manipulating a mass of heterogeneous material with great skill, he sees the same principle at work in the illumination of epic and dramatic poetry and literary prose texts; the detailed comparison of vases, sarcophagi, marble plaques, fresco paintings, metal reliefs, textiles, and medieval manuscripts convinces him that their models were to be found in illustrated papyrus rolls containing classical texts and that it was the illustrators of these rolls who invented the 'continuous narrative style' of illumination.

This view, attractive though it may be and supported though it is by a wealth of illustration—there are 140 figures in all—and by all the author's aesthetic expertise, suffers from an obvious weakness: of the literary papyrus fragments which have survived, now over two thousand from Egypt alone, those which bear illustrations may be counted on the fingers of one hand, and even their interpretation is uncertain. It follows that, in searching for the prototypes of Weitzmann's illustrations, we should not overlook other possible sources, for example, the murals and panels of the Hellenistic and even the classical period, which have met a fate even more unkind than that of the papyri. As for the 'continuous narrative style', it may well have originated in Hellenistic Egypt, but there are others who would prefer to place its origin elsewhere and farther back in time. It is significant that, so far as the reviewer can recall, there is not one single mention of Polygnotus throughout this book, and yet we have Pausanias' authority for his *Iliou Persis* and *Nostoi*, as well as for other 'cyclic' paintings, at Delphi. If there existed an Alexandrian school of painters, they may well have been influenced by classical painting of this kind in the development of a 'continuous narrative style', themselves in turn influencing any illustrators of papyrus rolls that there may have been.

It is indeed an unfortunate tendency in Weitzmann's book that he is prepared to disregard other possible hypotheses in his anxiety to establish his own, and in detailed discussion to accept evidence as being in his favour, when in fact it is ambiguous and may even tell against him. There is space here to mention only a few examples. Only one small fragment can be produced to support the theory that it was a common practice to illustrate the *Iliad* on papyrus; though it may be held to bear a certain similarity to a miniature in the Milan illustrated

Iliad, the scene is still a commonplace one and could well have been familiar from vases and frescoes, and not necessarily from an illustrated papyrus roll; the absence of an accompanying text, though not conclusive, still further reduces its value as evidence. Again, the fact that a miniature in an eleventh-century manuscript of the *Physiologus* represents a pair of sirens and the text alludes to their ability to infatuate passing sailors with their songs does not entitle Weitzmann to say, as he does, that it is 'very likely that the ultimate source for the siren [sic] of the *Physiologus* was an illustrated *Odyssey*'. Are we to suppose that a subject so obviously popular never attracted painters? Much is made of the Oxyrhynchus fragment 2331 as 'incontestable proof' of the cyclic illustration of poems other than those of the *ērōs κύκλος*; but a glance at D. L. Page's note in *C. R. n.s.* vii and Paul Maas's article in *Greece and Rome*, v. 2 will show that it is more likely that the fragment is part of a γρύλλος caricaturing the dodecathlon than of an illustrated *Heracleis*—the metre is, of course, not iambic, as Weitzmann writes, but a species of ionic, which does not help his view. Again, it is a tall order to base on one papyrus fragment of uncertain authorship (P.S.I. vii. 647) the claim that the texts of Attic New Comedy were 'enriched by miniatures', nor is it at all certain that the Paris illustrated roll of the second century A.D. should be described as a 'love romance'. And the attempt to present the original purpose of didactic poetry as *vulgarization*, in order to provide a link in illustrative technique between that employed in scientific treatises and that of the poetic texts, is surely wide of the mark; to go on straightway to cite Hesiod in this context makes matters worse: Hesiod wrote poetry because it was his natural medium of self-expression, not in order to sugar the pill of his 'teaching' for the majority, and many centuries later Lucretius clearly had no such intention.

This is in many ways a fascinating volume, but the case which it presents must be declared 'not proven'—until and unless considerably more illustrated papyrus fragments turn up. It is also an irritating volume, containing as it does so many ambiguities and errors in the use of words and phrases. And it is a mystery to the reviewer why the author should have preferred to cite 'statistics' from Oldfather's list of literary papyri, which he admits to be out of date, when Pack's inventory, of which he must surely not be ignorant, was published nearly eight years ago!

B. R. REES

University College, Cardiff

FERDINANDO DURAND: *La Poesia di Orazio*. Pp. 175. Turin: Loescher, 1959. Paper, L. 1,000.

THIS book shows the effect of applying Crocean principles to a highly classical poet. There is, we understand, only one true poetry, that of passion, 'un incoscibile bisogno di canto'. It is for all time, and must not be entangled in an historical situation. 'What interests us is the beating of a human heart' (pp. 24, 97, 55, 40). Verse that is not such poetry is not art either, but merely artifice (p. 101). It is hardly surprising that Horace should fail this test. What he (unfortunately) called his lyric poetry lacks 'liricità'. Even Pindar fails: 'oggi non si stima molto l'opera pindarica, che è più vicino all'oratoria che alla vera liricità' (p. 103).

One can sympathize with reaction against the superlatives of appreciative writing ('tutto luce', 'un vero gioiello', 'suffuso di ambrosia': Turolla)—until exasperation kills sympathy. Most of the poems are briefly evaluated seriatim. The *Sermones* are depreciated for not being poetry (pp. 124, 140), in disregard of Horace's own disclaimer (quoted on p. 130). Of course Horace had no 'sensibilità spirituale' for women, and as usual he is adversely compared with Catullus without account of the difference between middle age and youth (pp. 44 f.). Tradition is harmful, and literary, mythological, or historical allusion deprecated. Certain lines are praised 'even if they recall Sappho' (p. 75); others, of particular beauty, are dismissed with 'we are not interested either in Euterpe or Polyhymnia, or in the lyre of Lesbos' (p. 40); and *Herculis ritu* is criticized because 'the references to the Social War of 91 and the Servile War of 73 are nothing to us' (p. 92). In fact Horace was 'the greatest victim of erudition among all the famous lyric poets'—though, paradoxically, he does not owe very much to the Greek poets (pp. 68, 46).

Durand does appreciate *Aegam memento* and *Difugere niues*, but some of his judgements seem surprising even on his own premises (and he believes in the objectivity of poetic merit). *Quis desiderio* is omitted: 'nessuno (ne) fa oggi gran conto' (p. 60); also *Motum ex Metello*: 'inutile' (p. 63). Of the Roman Odes only 5 and 6 are worthy to survive; 4 is worth 'even less than' 3 (pp. 88, 84: Professor Fraenkel please note). The beauty and subtlety of Horace's art passed him by. 'To express yourself in a determined metre is no difficult thing' (p. 83; cf. 62). That an ode should begin by attacking Cleopatra and end by almost praising her

causes 'un certo stridore' (p. 58); that a grandiose one should tail off in

cur ualle permitem Sabina
diuitias operosiores?

is 'poco efficace, anzi disturbante' (p. 79). But then Horace was 'weak in architecture' (p. 47). He often failed also to fuse sense and metre (incidentally, Sapphics were 'the most ample and solemn metre he used'), and he was apt unnaturally to separate adjective from noun (pp. 106, 117, 36). The burlesque openings of the Odes to the Tree and the Wine-jar are characterized as rhetorical (pp. 70, 97); for the author shows no more evidence of humour than of sensibility. 'Siamo proprio ciechi?' he asks. Lo sei.

His work is addressed, not to specialists, but 'to all men of good taste, whether or not they know Latin' (p. 47). Every reader is invited to judge the quotations for himself (p. 173)—the Latinless presumably from the prose translations supplied. With one exception, only Italian works are cited; naturally, perhaps, since 'foreign authors have hitherto displayed a critical sensibility inferior to ours' (p. 13). Indeed if Horace had only had as confidant and friend a Francesco De Sanctis, he would have been guided in his lyrics by a different criterion' (p. 76).

The book claims to rest on the most modern aesthetic, but it suggests rather nineteenth-century romantic criticism run amok. It is a caricature of what Tyrrell might have produced if he had devoted a whole book to Horace. It might not seem worth troubling about, if it were not marked as 'segnalata come meritevole di premio' by the Accademia dei Lincei.

L. P. WILKINSON

King's College, Cambridge

Q. Horati Flacci *Opera tertium* recognovit FRIDERICUS KLINGNER. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxv+378. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth and boards, DM 17.

KLINGNER has given us a new Teubner text of Horace at intervals of roughly ten years. His first edition was published in 1939, his second (reviewed *C.R.*, lxi [1951], 180) in 1950, and his third in 1959.

The third edition is virtually a reprint of the second. The only changes are the addition of a further preface and a small number of alterations in the apparatus criticus and in the text. The preface (which occupies half a page) merely records Klingner's indebtedness to the recent work of Horatian scholars,

especially of Jachmann (*Zur Frage der Verswiederholung in der augusteischen Dichtung*), of Paul Maas (*Korruptelen in Horazens Oden*), and of Fraenkel (*Horace*). The variations in the text and apparatus of the third edition are largely accounted for by their influence.

For the purpose of the record the alterations of text are noted below (the reading of the second edition is in brackets): *Od. i. 32. 1, poscimus, si* (*poscimur: si*); *ibid. 15 mihi cumque salve* (*mihi cumque, salve,*); *iii. 5. 15 trahenti* (*trahentis*); *iii. 17. 5 ducit* (*ducis*); *iv. 8 delete 15 non celeres—19 reddit* along with 28 and 33 (delete 17 and 33); *Sat. i. 2. 13 delete, = A.P. 421; i. 4. 70 Sulgi* (*Sulci*); *i. 10. 83–84 uterque ambitione relegata. te* (*uterque. ambitions relegata te*); *ii. 3. 163 delete, cf. Epist. i. 6. 28; ii. 7. 83 sibi qui imperiosus* (*sibique imperiosus*); *Epist. ii. 1. 101 delete* (place after 107).

University of St. Andrews T. E. WRIGHT

GIOVANNI PAVANO: *Introduzione alla lingua etrusca e saggio di traduzione*. Pp. 82. Turin: Gheroni, 1959. Paper.

The promising title and attractive appearance of this little book are well calculated to appeal to the reader who wishes to acquire a knowledge of Etruscan. On opening it he may feel the first slight chill when he observes that the house that prints it cannot provide Greek type—Greek words are reproduced from handwriting. Full disillusion is reached on the first page of the introductory epistle. Pavano, after a caution to his readers not to form superficial judgements of his work, states that Etruscan is a pre-Greek language, that Chinese is an Indo-European language, and that translation from Etruscan may be achieved by means of Sino-Greek historical and comparative grammar. Before closing the book, the reader may wish to see the method applied. He will find a good specimen in Pavano's version of *azaru* (no. 49): 'o sole, vivi e ruota'. The process by which this interpretation is reached is set out in the introductory epistle: 'A. abbrev. di *ἀρετός*, al voc. s.: *ο sole*—ZA, imperat di *ζάω*, sin.: *tsai*: *vivi*—RU, sin. su = *risalire*; qui imperat. di *ruo*, lt.: *ruota*'. This example may be left to speak for itself and for the whole book. To avoid superficiality, comment is withheld until the appearance of a Sino-Greek comparative grammar. Meanwhile those who desire an introduction to Etruscan will continue to read the works of Etruscologists, none of whom, except Pallottino, is mentioned by Pavano.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

RONALD A. KNOX: *In Three Tongues*. Edited by L. E. EYRES. Pp. xiv + 168. London: Chapman and Hall, 1959. Cloth. 18s. net.

OF Ronald Knox's *tria corda*, the present reviewer, with a passing commendation of the piece called 'Pericles v. Cicero', which cleverly contrives to parody Thucydides and Cicero and certain of their translators, is concerned only with two. Books of Latin and Greek compositions are rare nowadays (not so in the nineteenth century: witness the books by Munro, Shilleto, Jebb, and the many school collections—*Sabrinæ Corolla* and the rest) and recently there have only been *Some Oxford Compositions* and now this: *βαύδ μέν, ἀλλὰ ρόβα*. Knox's work is *sui generis*. He found his easiest expression in parody, as his biographer has recently pointed out, and the more seemingly intractable his material, the more astonishingly brilliant the result. Sir Robert Tate's notorious rendering of 'There's a breathless hush in the close to-night' is commonplace beside Knox's 'translation' of Jabberwocky (*καυσπροῦντος ηδη, γλοισχρά δια περισκά / στρυβλοῦντα και στρομφοῦντ'* ἀν εὐρύσκοις τόφα κτλ.) or (into Latin Elegiacs) of the Astinol Pine Bath advertisement ('Consule si peteres Plano, quis credere vellet / balnea constitui pinea posse domi?' etc.) or his 'Fragment of a Telephoniazusae', while his mastery of the technopaignion (e.g. the mnemonics in Latin Elegiacs and Greek Iambica for learning π to 30 decimal places) suggests that he would have been at home with any of the Alexandrians. 'Tit-willow' and 'Auld Lang Syne' are effortlessly put into rhyming Greek, keeping the English metres—but this list of *tours de force* could be continued almost indefinitely, and the reviewer will only single out the Theocritean hexameters which won the Gaisford Greek Verse Prize in 1908. Here, above all, Knox showed that he could translate and not, as elsewhere, transmute, and the reader is not beguiled, as sometimes he is, by Knox's matchless facility into accepting as translation that which is—as many prize composers would agree—easier, namely, creation. Examples are the versions, in Latin Elegiacs, of the 'School Report' and 'A Letter from the Front'; and elsewhere, as in the 'Ulixes Penelopæ' letter, a parody of the *Heroïdes*, Knox, completely freed from the trammels of an English text, shows to even better advantage his mastery of Ovid's style. Virtually all Knox's Elegiacs are Ovidian; Ovid's sometimes almost self-parodying style lends itself far more readily to Knox's imitative talents than the darker tones of Propertius.

(Remember, in this connexion, how many schoolboys can produce a passable imitation of Ovid, and how few can produce anything remotely resembling Horace or Virgil.)

This book is all jam, with no bread-and-butter, and neither the schoolmaster nor the classical tutor will find anything here which he could set his pupils; but it will be among them, or those of them who still practise the art of verse composition, that the book will mostly find its readers. It is also, perhaps, an anachronism: Knox, who was an Old Etonian, wrote many of his cleverest pieces while a master at Shrewsbury in the First World War. Will either of these famous versifying schools ever produce another such phenomenon?

It is perhaps captious to complain of one 'atque', left unelided, and in the second half of a pentameter (see M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 78 ff.), but the reviewer, in place of 'Horridus ante oculos esurit atque viret' humbly offers to Knox's shade, 'Horridus ante oculos esuriens viret'.

COLIN LEACH

HERMANN BENGSTON: *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*. Pp. viii + 205. Munich: Beck, 1959. Cloth, DM 12.50.

IN C.R. lxiv (1950), 124–5 M. Cary properly welcomed the first edition of this work (1949), which has now run into a third. Bengtson has sought to keep it up to date, and though I have made no collation with an earlier edition, I have noted numerous recent works cited in his bibliographies and in the text, for instance a paragraph on Linear B. (Bengtson suspends judgement on the decipherment, and cites, besides the works of Ventris and Chadwick, only the sceptical articles of Grumach and Beattie.) Cary mentioned some omissions in the first edition; now at least the importance for chronology of eclipses is brought out. I should have expected some warning on the problem of interpolations in Roman legal texts; and some mention of Acts of the Martyrs, Christian and Alexandrian. Church history is indeed left out, and *Kulturgeschichte* in general occupies little space. The select general bibliography at the end seems to me too subjective (which is inevitable); in a future edition I think it might well give place to other material; would it not be enough to refer to works, like Bengtson's own admirable *Gr. Geschichte*, where more complete bibliographies can be found? But we must not ask too much,

and it is unfair to cavil at a work of learning and lucidity that few (if any) could match.

Oriel College, Oxford

P. A. BRUNT

ANDRÉ BONNARD: *Greek Civilization. From the Antigone to Socrates*. Translated by A. L. SELLS. Pp. 248; 32 plates. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959. Cloth, 30s. net.

TOWARDS the end of this book, the French original of which was published at Lausanne in 1957, Professor Bonnard says that his object has been to present 'a few of the masterpieces of the golden age of Greek civilization—the second half of the fifth century'; and his sub-title, following on that of his first volume (*From the Iliad to the Parthenon*, reviewed in this journal, June 1958), might seem to confirm this version of his subject. But in fact this series of essays ranges over topics which take us far outside this short period, including the early history of Greek art and the beginnings of Ionian science. The late fifth century supplies the book's focal point rather than its chronological limits, and such unity as it possesses is one of theme rather than of time. The theme seems to be an exaggerated version of the humanism of much recent French literature; an assertion of confidence in the human intellect and the human spirit in the face of destiny which Bonnard appears to see as the keynote of fifth-century literature and art, but which any Greek, I imagine, would have regarded as outrageous. The message of the last part of the *Antigone* is that 'world is coming to birth in which no Antigone will ever be doomed to execution and no Creon plunged into stupor, because man, grasping the sword that divided him, and equal now to the contest with fatality, will have overcome the tragic forces'. Democritus 'assures us of the greatness of our vocation as men'.

Although much of his book is a narrative of events, Bonnard is no historian. He has a vaguely sociological approach to Greek history which sometimes suggests a milk-and-water Marxism: Solon is the initiator of a peasant revolution, Periclean imperialism is utterly condemned, Plato is reactionary, and so on. But he has no clear method of handling evidence, Marxist or otherwise. Some of his 'facts' are inaccurate, others no more than half-truths. His treatment of 'The Enigma of Socrates' is typical. After a sketchy account of the sources of our information for the historical Socrates, he condemns 'the myopia of critics poring over living texts which they dissect as though dealing with

corpses'. 'The true Socrates is the one who lives on in our memory. . . . The historical Socrates and the legendary are one and the same person, a living person because an active one.' This baffling conclusion is followed by a biographical portrait of Socrates which in fact involves a series of arbitrary judgements on the evidence.

Bonnard's approach, in short, is rhetorical, and this determines the character of both his thought and his style, for which French is perhaps better suited than English. He is most effective in his descriptions of extant literature. His accounts of the *Antigone* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the *Epinician Odes*, and some of Aristophanes' comedies have an *élan* which carries the reader on and should stimulate his desire to read the works themselves; although, unfortunately, some of the translations chosen for inclusion in the English version have little of the vitality suggested in Bonnard's narrative. He is at his worst, on the other hand, in the chapter on 'The Birth of Science', in which a muddled précis of Marxist explanations of the origin of science is followed by six pages, fact and gossip inextricably mixed, on Thales, the same sort of thing on Democritus, and between them a single page in which Anaximander (for example) receives seven lines.

The book is illustrated with thirty-two full-page photographs of varying merit and interest. The point of some is not clear, and most are placed outside the chapters to which they are relevant. There is no reference to them in the text. Pictures, good printing, and wide margins make a handsome volume.

H. C. BALDRY

University of Southampton

EDUARD SCHWARTZ: *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*. (Gesammelte Schriften, Band iii.) Pp. xii+334. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1959. Cloth, DM 42.

No student of fourth-century history, whether secular or ecclesiastical, travels far without discovering that he has one supreme guide through the tangle, namely, the nine astounding articles that Schwartz published in the Göttingen *Nachrichten* from 1904 to 1911. They have lost none of their value in the half-century that has elapsed, and for the beginner they remain a revelation of historical method and a model of critical appraisal of sources. This third volume of his collected writings is accordingly the most important of the series hitherto published. The editors have added discreet references to critical editions that have appeared in the

intervening period and to places where Schwartz subsequently corrected himself. The long *retractatio*, 'Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts', *Zeits.f.d.N.T.Wiss.* xxiv (1935), they have held over for the next volume. The fourth paper on Constantine's rise to monarchy is omitted on the ground that its thesis is stated in more developed form in *Kaiser Constantinus und die christliche Kirche*² (1936); and, by a wise decision, 55 of the 70 pages of bitter polemic against Harnack are also left out. It is now universally recognized that Harnack was wrong, and it is distasteful to watch a revolver being emptied into a corpse, dead from the first bullet. Otherwise the articles are reprinted in their original form.

All learned men make mistakes and Schwartz was not exempt. I think him quite wrong about the date of the fall of Marcellus of Ancyra (pp. 234 ff.). The critique of the documents regarding the death of Arius is disappointing (p. 257). But such points only serve to underline Schwartz's achievement. A larger query may be put against his presupposition that the doctrinal controversies of the church were only a polite fig-leaf to hide the nakedness of power politics and personal rivalries between bishops. Certainly there was much more to the Arian controversy than a dispute about the dogma of Nicaea. But Schwartz was reacting against the hagiographical approach to the Church Fathers, influenced perhaps unawares by that submerged tradition of hostility to Athanasius which has had its roots in the old Unitarian polemic against orthodoxy and in the notion that the doctrine of the 'Athanasian' or even the Nicene creed could somehow be invalidated by throwing mud at Athanasius's morals. (Cf. Isaac Newton's *Theological Manuscripts*, ed. H. McLachlan, Liverpool, 1950.) Fourth-century history offers easy game for the cynical. But it is probable that neither the sentimental halo of traditional orthodoxy nor the cynical 'realism' of profane secularism has hitherto told us the truth about it.

Christ Church, Oxford

H. CHADWICK

HANS WALTER: *Vom Sinnwandel griechischer Mythen*. Pp. 56; 50 figs. Waldsassen (Bayern): Stiftland-Verlag, 1959. Cloth.

This is a popular account of the change in the outlook of Greek art between roughly the middle of the fifth century B.C. and the middle of the fourth century B.C. The author

sees this change as a new awareness of the psychological forces at work in man's mind and the representation of them in pictures and statues of divine and mythological figures, an obvious case being the frequent figures of Eros, Himeros, and Pothos in sculpture and painting. It is curious that the author does not discuss the names frequently inscribed against the women who accompany Dionysus or Aphrodite on vases of the late fifth century, as an indication of the states of mind in which the painter was interested. The illustrations are from excellent photographs of vases illustrating Dionysus and his followers, Aphrodite and Hera, Helen, Europa, Thetis, Amymone, Atalanta, and at the end some well-known statues. Museum numbers and references would have helped those who want to pursue the subject further.

T. B. L. WEBSTER

University College, London

W. DEONNA: *Un divertissement de table 'A cloche-pied'*. (Collection Latomus, xl.) Pp. 40. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 60 B. fr.

SEVERAL passages in ancient authors and a number of vases and other art-monuments testify to an after-dinner sport which consisted of standing on one leg, or adopting some other awkward and more or less acrobatic pose, while drinking. Deonna has collected a good supply of these references and analyses them, adding several which are rather scenes from the palaestra than from the symposium. He gives a selection of parallels from other than classical cultures, including some curious pieces of ritual, and suggests (p. 30) that a ritual origin is not unlikely for some at least of the ancient feats of equilibrium, though he frankly admits that this cannot be proved. I doubt if it is even probable.

I note with approval that his citations from ancient authors generally give a correct reference to the original texts, not simply to French translations which may or may not be available here. There are a few small slips: on p. 28, in describing the game mentioned by Pollux ix. 121, he overlooks the words *τῷ φερομένῳ ποδὶ*; the hopping pursuer had not simply to come up with one of the other players but to 'bump' him with his free foot. Hesych., *ἔξαγω χωλὸν τραγύσκον* does not mean '*je chasse un petit bouc boiteux*' (*ibid.*). P. 34, Pliny, *N.H.* vii. 22, the gymnosopists do not stand on one and the

same leg all day, but *alternis pedibus*, sometimes on one leg and sometimes on the other.

St. Andrews

H. J. Rose

W. DEONNA: *Mercure et le scorpion*. (Collection Latomus, xxxvii.) Pp. 50. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 75 B.fr.

AMONG the many attributes of Hermes-Mercurius in late iconography, one of the most remarkable is the scorpion, found chiefly on African monuments. Deonna, with his usual diligence, sets out to trace this history of this non-Hellenic association, and with very great verisimilitude, indeed almost certainty, supposes an Oriental origin; in particular, he is somewhat inclined (pp. 28 ff., 41), to attach it to Shadrafa the Canaanite and Palmyrean deity. On the way to and from the Near East he collects no small amount of interesting material concerning astrological and other symbolism. The African Mercurius is, as he rightly holds (pp. 38 ff.), largely the product of identification with an important local god.

On p. 44 the printers have libellously attributed bad French to the author; for *sans avoir éprouver* read either *sans avoir éprouvé* or simply *sans éprouver*. On p. 19, n. 6, the reference to Manilius should read ii. 236, not 432, and the quotation from him at line 8 *acer et ictu*, not *acer ictu*. On the next page, Manilius iv. 553 ff. has nothing to do with agriculture; he who is born under Scorpio, if other stellar influences agree, will be either a noteworthy founder of cities or a destroyer of them. Many of the references are unsatisfactory; why cite the long-obsolete editions of Nisard in this year of grace, and odder still, why '*Casina, acte ii, sc. viii'* for *Casina 443* in the quotation from Plautus, p. 45, n. 2? Again, p. 39, n. 4, why cite four secondary authorities for a remark of St. Augustine instead of referring directly to his text, *Enarr. in Ps. Ixii. 7?* P. 40, I doubt the Oriental origin of Hermes' kerykeion. But these are faults of detail only.

St. Andrews

H. J. Rose

HANS VOLKMAR HERRMANN: *Omphalos*. (Orbis Antiquus, Heft 13.) Pp. 124; 12 plates, 7 figs. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1959. Paper, DM 9.80.

This booklet is the printed version of a dissertation on one of the most perplexing

objects in ancient Greek religion—the Omphalos. Noting that hump-shaped altars appear on 'Tyrrhenian' vases and on Hero and Nymph reliefs, the author is led to suggest that in origin the omphalos is a chthonic altar. He rightly notes that the Delphic equation of the Omphalos of Ga with the navel of the earth is a conception that cannot have antedated Ionic study of the world, and assumes that the omphalos itself was an old, pre-Apolline cult-object. But he justly dissociates it from primitive stone worship and pillar cults, and he scorns the notion that it may have been a petrified grave-mound or stele. He then proceeds to investigate the various round forms associated with the worship of heroes, the dead, and chthonic deities, such as beehive tombs, tholoi of heroes, hollow altars, bothroi, and grave tumuli, and attempts to fix the omphalos in this milieu. Unfortunately he is obliged to dismiss in a footnote ash-altars like those of Olympia and Didyma, which might seem to offer closer parallels for the omphalos-altar; and his argument seems to be weakened thereby.

The conclusion reached is that the original form of the omphalos-altar was an earth or stone heap through which liquid offerings percolated to those below, and that its translation into solid stone is a secondary development. A series difficulty arises here—such stone omphaloi as have come to light (including now the one discovered in the anteroom of the oracle at Claros) have not been perforated to serve as offering channels; and Herrmann's explanation that the primitive altar has been translated into a monumental (and so impermeable) form hardly accords with the normal Greek sense of the fitness of things. In the concluding pages Herrmann establishes the omphalos as part of the furniture of the Eleusis sanctuary and identifies a well-known figure of fourth-century vase-painting as the earth goddess on her oracular seat, reflecting a statue presumed to have been set up at Delphi or, possibly, Eleusis.

Much of the discussion is valuable, especially the last sections and the account of the modifications of form that chthonic altars underwent; and some dead wood is cut away. If the conclusion reached is not completely convincing, that is inherent in the nature of the subject and the time. Herrmann's dissertation was completed in 1951 before Bousquet shattered established belief by his demonstration that the conveniently labelled primeval omphalos in the Delphi Museum was a modern capstone; and though he duly notes Bousquet's discovery Herrmann is in

Doubt
histor
altoge
Unive

KAR
i: T
and
(Bol
148.
1955
THIS
Sam
testim
dilig
merit
here
thrac
each
A
The
close
tion
with
ing.
and
series
two
are r
pass
the r
give
dem
sequ
alter
for
subc
No.
num
be a
app
and
is p
erro
mon
had
refe
dan
the
on b
perfe
and
han
T
they
ting

fact still under the influence of the old belief. Doubts must now be raised whether the pre-history of the omphalos does not require an altogether more sceptical approach.

University of Bristol

J. M. COOK

KARL LEHMANN (editor): *Samothrace i: The Ancient Literary Sources*. Edited and translated by NAPHTALI LEWIS. (Bollingen Series ix. 1.) Pp. xv+148. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959. Cloth, \$7.50.

This is the first volume of Lehmann's Samothrace publication. Some 250 literary *testimonia* relating to the island have been diligently assembled; and being deemed to merit a volume to themselves, they are here presented by Naphtali Lewis as *Samothrace i*. There is an English translation of each passage.

A few minor criticisms may be offered. The passages are occasionally trimmed too close, so that part of the relevant documentation is lost. The critical apparatus is abridged, with the result that it is sometimes misleading. The translations are, where possible, and not always wisely, taken from the Loeb series. To give instances, in passage no. 1 two changes from the manuscript reading are noted, but there is no hint that the whole passage represents a drastic remodelling of the manuscript text. In no. 2 the translation 'gives the impression' is inadequate; it is demonstration of a fact. Here and subsequently small c after the numeral in the alternative reference should be capital C before the numeral; it is not intended to mark a subdivision, but Casaubon's pagination. No. 4, 'fig. 47' is in fact 48 in the standard numbering. In no. 6 'Samothracia' seems to be a misprint for 'Samothrace' (unless Frick's apparatus is at fault). No. 7 is decapitated and misleading at a number of points. It is perhaps unkind to cavil at such trifling errors; but this useful collection of *testimonia* would have been even more useful if it had freed the reader from the necessity of referring back to the editions; and there is a danger that the unwary may fail to recognize the limitations that the editor has imposed on himself. A little more commentary would perhaps have helped to make this collection of texts more interesting and informative; and a good bibliography would have enhanced the value of the work.

The main interest of these texts is the light they throw on the important cult which distinguished this otherwise obscure island; and

the value of this volume will become more apparent as the publication of the sanctuary proceeds. The second volume, dealing with the inscriptions, is in hand, and a further seven volumes are projected. This is therefore the appropriate moment to congratulate Lehmann and the Bollingen Foundation on the commencement of the publication, to wish them every success in the further development of the series, and to await its fulfilment with pleasurable anticipation.

University of Bristol

J. M. COOK

HENRY S. ROBINSON: *The Athenian Agora. Vol. v: Pottery of the Roman Period, Chronology*. Pp. xiv+149; 76 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1959. Cloth, \$12.50.

THE publication of the vast mass of the Roman pottery from the Athenian Agora has presented serious problems. It is neither possible nor desirable that every single piece should be published, and a selective publication has therefore been undertaken. The limits fixed for 'Roman' pottery here are Sulla's sack of Athens in 86 B.C. and the introduction of Byzantine glazed wares in the seventh century. Within these limits the chronological framework is established in the present volume by the publication of the finds from eight key-deposits; and the analysis of wares and history of vase-forms will be presented in a second volume with the sub-title 'Typology'. It might seem that eight is a small number of deposits when the best part of eight centuries have to be spanned. But the deposits are themselves chronologically subdivided; no less than fourteen different layers of filling have been recognized in a single well (M).

The evidence for the dating of red-glazed wares is of first-class importance: so also, among the fine wares, the last flicker of West Slope, the rerudescence of Megarian or cognate moulded bowls, and the appearance of a 'Roman Relief Bowl'. Examples of striped ware in deposits of imperial times are disconcerting for the field archaeologist who is accustomed to regard such surface sherds as Hellenic. But the value of this collection consists above all in the serried ranks of plain domestic vessels and storage jars that descend in orderly succession through the centuries. It is here that the Agora excavation makes its incomparable contribution to the archaeology, and thereby to the history, of the eastern Roman Empire.

This volume, with its companion 'Typology', will rank among the classic works, along with Rostovtzeff and the British Museum Coins.

Robinson's publication of this endless chain of crockery is exemplary. The photographs are, as usual, excellent, and reinforced by drawings and sections. The highlights are a Dionysus face stūla, some unexpected, almost Minoan lines in painted floral design, animal-headed dish-handles, moulded lamp tondi, a hideous incense-burner (in Beirut), and a good woolly dog and bird in terracotta charmingly posed in one photograph. There is also an interesting lot of potter's marks, dipinti and graffiti, with some ingenious interpretations by Mabel Lang and opportune datings by the Actian era; in H 33 should *περιφωνη* not rather be a female name?

University of Bristol

J. M. COOK

A. ADRIANI: *Divagazioni intorno ad una coppa paesistica del museo di Alessandria*. Pp. vii+85; 58 plates, 12 figs. Rome: Bretschneider, 1959. Paper, L. 10,000.

This study, in the 'Documenti e ricerche d'arte alessandrina' series, is concerned with defending the existence (denied by some) in the Hellenistic and Roman periods of an Alexandrine art properly so called, and, in particular, of a specifically Alexandrine type of landscape-art. The jumping-off point of Dr. Adriani's investigations is a bronze bowl in the Museum of Alexandria. But the bulk of the book consists of five 'digressions' or 'excursions', four of which contain detailed descriptions and discussions of works of art of various categories that can either be brought into relation with the bowl or, in the author's judgement, be assigned, like it, to an Alexandrine origin; while a fifth 'divagazione' provides an account of the different kinds of Graeco-Roman landscape-styles and of the leading centres which produced them. A final chapter recapitulates, somewhat over-repetitively, the conclusions already reached.

No one today would question Adriani's major point, that landscape-motifs were well developed in Hellenistic art before the opening of the Roman period in east-Mediterranean lands. And it is a pleasure (all too rare) to read from an Italian pen a recognition as complete and just as that found here of Rome's aesthetic debt to Hellenism, of the absolute continuity in style, and the frequent continuity in themes, between the arts of Hellenistic and Roman times. We are

grateful, too, for Adriani's reaction against the 'pan-Alexandrism' of the Schreiber school. He concedes to Asia Minor the leading role in the formation of funerary, erotic, and mythological landscapes, while claiming for Alexandria a special line in idyllic, bucolic, allegorical, and Dionysiac landscape-subjects. It was, he seeks to demonstrate, in this special Alexandrine tradition that the landscape-artists of the Roman period worked.

All the same, the nature and extent of Ptolemaic Alexandria's contributions to ancient art are not easily assessed. It would, indeed, be reasonable to attribute to Alexandrine workshops objects from Egypt adorned with Egyptian motifs or made in Egyptian media, such as stucco (e.g. the Begram, etc., stucco 'medallions'), or cast, as in the case of some decorated handles of metal vessels, from moulds found in Egypt. But apart from the portraits of Ptolemaic personages or reliefs that contain such portraits, such as the well-known British Museum 'Apotheosis of Homer' piece (signed, incidentally, by an Asiatic sculptor), there are very few works of art in the large array which Adriani has assembled that can be dated, on really solid grounds, to a pre-Roman period. The transformation of Egypt into a Roman province by Augustus, and the important part that the country subsequently played in imperial politics and economics, started recurring fashions for things Egyptian among Romans of many ranks, not unlike the fascination that the Far East had for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europeans of varying levels of culture. Such Egyptianizing objects could, then, have been produced in Egypt for export to the Roman market—or in Italy and elsewhere by artists equipped with Egyptianizing copy-books. Some works of an idyllic, bucolic, or Dionysiac, but not specifically Egyptian, character are linked by Adriani with pre-Roman Alexandria for very insufficient reasons—sometimes merely on the score of allusions to such topics in Alexandrine literature. Yet in the late-Hellenistic and Roman epochs such subjects were part of a world-wide 'koine' and one would expect to find them in widely separated areas and spread over many centuries. There are, for instance, strong arguments (cf. *J.R.S.* xxxix [1949], 36) for dating the so-called 'Ptolemy Cup' in the early imperial period and none that is clinching for connecting it with Alexandria. As for the bronze bowl—the 'coppa paesistica'—itself, with its scenes that suggest a mystery-cult, with Athena and Atys as protagonists in their after-life capacities, or the episode of Athena and Marsyas (see *Gnomon* xxxii, 1960, pp. 290 f.),

rather than some mythological story that cannot now be identified—Adriani's first thought of assigning it to the first century B.C. or A.D. was surely right. His present third-to-second-century B.C. dating strikes this reviewer as too early; and of all the parallels to it in shape that he illustrates, the bronze candelabra-bowls, like it, handleless and foot-less, impress one as being far closer to it than do the Gnathian *crateres*.

The problem of the prototypes of the great painted landscapes of Roman Italy—the Vatican *Odyssey* landscapes, the landscape from Prima Porta, etc.—still remains unsolved.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

Newnham College, Cambridge

QUENTIN F. MAULE and H. R. W. SMITH: *Votive Religion at Caere: Prolegomena*. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 4, No. 1.) Pp. x+128; 5 plates, 8 figs. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959. Paper, \$3.

This tripartite discussion starts from a little group of terracotta figurines, belonging to a large find of such objects near Cerveteri, made in 1885. They represent a warrior in somewhat peculiar equipment, whom Furtwängler, judging from the one specimen known to him, declared to be a Gaul. There are now six at Berkeley and many more to come when all the Caeretan terracottas which the University possesses are published. From study of these, reported in considerable detail, the authors conclude that the armed men are not Gauls but figures of Mars, or Maris, a theory which appears to the reviewer not unreasonable, and which leads to a discussion of many matters, partly belonging to the history of ancient Italian art, partly, and more controversially, to the study of Italian religion. One interesting point is made on p. 13 and several times returned to; the authors call it polylatry and consider it chiefly Italian. It is the tendency to provide the chief deity of a temple with a suitable retinue, or group of visitors, of divine rank, in this case to give Artumes, as the goddess of the temple to which presumably these little votive figures belonged may have been, the company of Maris among other acquaintances of her own divine rank.

When, in pp. 60–100, the discussion moves to 'some matters of method', there is a certain amount of tilting at windmills.

Rightly enough, it is urged that archaeological, especially votive, material should be given its due place in our apparatus, but it is hard to see how this would lead to 'a degree of respect for ages and phases which would put the student of origins out of employment' (p. 60). The 'student of origins' is by the very nature of his interests bound to take 'ages and phases' into account at every turn, in order to penetrate, if possible, to the earliest beginnings of a given cult and pass on to its developments in later times. And indications abound that works on Italian, especially Roman, religion which do not confine themselves to archaeological evidence have not been studied with the care and understanding bestowed on the many reports of the discovery of material objects which are cited in the copious notes. For example, 'many scholars' are alleged (p. 67) to hold a 'general axiom . . . that all trust for help in childbirth and child care springs from earth worship'. This is quite a new doctrine to me; I agree that it is false, whoever the 'many scholars' that hold it may be. Again, in several passages, while criticizing certain remarks of mine on Mater Matuta, they suppose me to hold sundry views which I have never held and one or two of which I had never heard. I therefore mistrust some of the more general conclusions at which they arrive, while considering their views on particular points worthy of consideration, not least the repeated interpretation of divine female figures holding children as indicating, not divine offspring, but rather the care of the goddess for the children of her worshippers.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

PAUL MORAUX: *Une imprécation funéraire à Néocésarée*. (Bibl. Arch. et Hist. de l'Institut Français d'Istanbul, iv.) Pp. 56; 4 plates. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1959. Paper.

SINCE 1959 the museum at Tokat has possessed a handsomely wrought tomb-inscription, obviously put up by some person of means and good education. Its date, to judge by the lettering and other indications, is some time after A.D. 150. Moraux has studied it carefully and publishes it with clear photographs and a sufficient commentary, made still more serviceable by good indexes, the work of L. Robert, whom the author warmly thanks for abundant help and advice. The general contents are of a kind not unfamiliar, elaborate curses on violators of the tomb (obviously a family

sepulchre) with the addition of blessings on those who respect it. But the style is highly interesting, for it shows such close resemblance to the well-known inscriptions of Herodes Atticus that Moraux is not rash in concluding (p. 48) that the author was actually a pupil of that great rhetorician. That he knew Attica is further suggested by his including Dacira among the deities invoked.

I have noted but one doubtful statement; Artemis is hardly likely (p. 29) to be of Aslan origin, though of course Hekate is.

St. Andrews

H. J. Rose

Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae. Vols. ii, iii. (*Eos*, vol. xlvi, fasc. 2, 3.) Pp. viii+409; vi+497. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1957. Cloth, zł. 75, 92.

(ii) A. Fuks, Kritias, *Pseudo-Herodes and Thessaly*; S. Sberny, *De novo comoediae novae fragmento*; V. Steffen, *Qua lege fretus Cleon Aristophanem in iudicium deduxerit?*; L. Amundsen, *S. Eitrem, Sale of Wine on delivery* (P. Osl. inv. no. 1440); A. Bataille, *Un inventaire de vêtements inédit*; L. Casson, *New Light on Maritime Loans*; H. Henne, *Xρόνος ἐντύπως* (P. Ent. 15. 5.); C. Kunderewicz, *Évolution historique de la responsabilité des fonctionnaires dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque*; D. Meredith, *Inscriptions from Amethyst Mines at Abu Diyeiba*; W. Peremans, *E. Van't Dack, Notes concernant P.S.I. viii. 969*; A. Świderek, *Zénon fils d'Agréophon de Caunos et sa famille*; E. G. Turner, *A Note on P. Hamburg 132*; J. Vergote, *Le Nouveau Testament et la papyrologie juridique*; F. de Visscher, *La pseudo-stipulation ἐπερωτηθεὶς ἀμολόγησα*; F. Zucker, *Personennamen in J. Scherer's 'Papyrus de*

Philadelphie'; B. Biondi, *Aspetti universali e perenni del pensiero giuridico romano*; J. F. Gillian, *Enrolment in the Roman Imperial Army*; E. Nardi, *L'origine della ritenzione*; L. Robert, *Inscriptions et institutions agonistiques*; M. Boháček, *Zur Geschichte der Stationarii von Bologna*; J. Cvetler, *The authorship of the Novel on the Reform of Legal Education at Constantinople* (Cod. Vat. Graec. 676); K. Koranyi, *Zur Geschichte antiker Rechtgrundsätze im mittelalterlichen Recht*.

(iii) S. Eisenstadt, *Paralleleinklische in das jüdische und römische Erbrecht*; V. Arangio-Ruiz, *Una divisione di area edificatoria a Tebtynis* (P. Univ. Stat. Milano no. 91); H. Braunert, *Zur Terminologie der Volkszählung im frühen römischen Ägypten*; A. Calderini, *Alcuni rilievi preliminari di toponomastica greco-egiziana*; R. Cantarella, *Dal papirero ercolanese 1413* (ii); A. d'Ors, *Notulas sobre los Apokrimata de P. Col. 123*; H. Kupiszewski, *Les Formulaires dans la procédure d'exécution*; C. Michurski, *Les Avances aux embilles et les prêts de semences dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*; J. Modrzewski, *Note sur P. Strasb. 237 (ἀγράφος et ἔγγραφος νόμος)*; W. Müller, *Zensus-deklaration einer civis Romana* (P. Ibscher 10); K. Preisendanz, *Ein Wiener Papyrusfragment zum Testamentum Salomonis*; V. Tcherikover, *Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered*; F. de Robertis, *La responsabilità del 'negotiorum gestor' nel diritto giustinianeo*; W. Kunkel, *Auctoratus*; U. von Lübtow, *Cato's leges venditioni et locationi dictae*; R. Monier, *La position de Labéon vis à vis de l'expression 'morbus vitiumve' de l'édit des édiles*; J. H. Oliver, *A Spanish Corporation and its Patrons*; W. Osuchowski, *Le Caractère juridique de l'actio civilis incerti à la lumière des scolies des Basiliques* (D. 2. 14. 7. 2); C. Welles, *The Chronology of Dura-Europos*; M. Wyszyński, *Quamvis si liberum esset noluisse, tamen coactus volui* (D. 4. 2. 21. 5 Paulus).

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

MNEMOSTYNE

4TH SERIES XIII (1960), FASC. II

J. D. Meerwaldt, *Epithalamica II*: (a) gives a nine-line metrical version, with comment, of the passage discussed in *Mnem.* vii, in which Himerius paraphrases Sappho (cf. Edmonds

fr. 147); (b) reconstructs Sappho fr. 30 L.-P., attributing alternate stanzas to youths and maidens; cf. Aesch. fr. 43 N. H. Wagenvoort, *De dea Cerere de qua eius mysterii Romanis*: criticizes H. le Bonniec, *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome* (Paris, 1958). J. H. Jongkees, *The Tomb of St. Peter*: the tomb the shaft of which

has been discovered on the Vatican was undoubtedly that which from about A.D. 160 was firmly believed to be St. Peter's and venerated as such, but it cannot be earlier than 120 and so is not the original; if it was the saint's, which cannot be proved, his remains must have been reburied there.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

VOL. XXIV, FASC. 1: 1960

M. Lejeune, *Essais de philologie mycénienne*, vi: analyses nouns of agent and instrument in -τηρ (-τρα), -τήριον, -τρός, and -τρόν. E. de Saint Denis, *Un manuscrit ignoré de Pline l'Ancien*: Ms. 263 of the Bibliothèque Municipale at Le Mans is a twelfth-century book, probably English, akin to Arundelianus and Oxoniensis: examines the readings of these manuscripts in book x, supplementing and correcting Mayhoff's apparatus. J. André, *Notes sur une édition récente d'Athènée* (Desrousseaux, 1956): 25 notes on botanical terms. P. Antin, *Touches classiques et chrétiennes juxtaposées chez Saint Jérôme*: discusses the occurrences of classical phrases and exempla, especially in J.'s more mannered letters and prefices and in his polemical writing. R. Joly, *Notes critiques pour le νερὶ διάτητης pseudohippocratique*. J. Granarolo draws attention to G. Billanovich's argument that Catullus' poems were known to Paduan humanists half a century before the supposed date of Campesani's verses. G. Stégen finds in Ovid, *A.A.* ii. 268 a malicious misunderstanding of Virg. *Ed.* 5. 52.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

CII. 4: 1959

E. Bickel, *Kant und Seneca. Der bestirnte Himmel über mir und das moralische Gesetz in mir*: Sen. *Ep.* 64. 6 is perhaps the sole influence on Kant, *Kritik d. pr. V.*, Beschluss, rather than Aristot. *fr.* 10 Rose and Plato, *Legg.* 966d-e, which are generally adduced as sources. W. Kranz, *Pythagoras in den Carmina Cantabrigiensia*: examines this eleventh-century collection of Rhenish origin for the knowledge of Pythagoras found in it and studies in detail Sequence 12. V. Pisani, *Altlateinisches iopetoi und die Duenos-Inscriptio*: translates and scans the inscription, and takes *iopetoi* = *fututioni*. F. Lasserre, *Aux origines de l'Anthologie: ii. Les Thalyses de Thocrite*: the poem is essentially a series of variations on themes of contemporary epigrams. W. Jaeger, *Echo eines unerkannten Tragikerfragments in Clemens' Brief an die Korinther*: traces Clemens, *ad Cor.* 20 back to a verse from tragedy (not in Nauck), which is

incorporated in Achilles Tatius (160, 30-31 Hercher) and also influenced Plato, Philo, and Crito laus. R. Stark, *Wahrscheinliches und Unwahrscheinliches von Aischylos*: (i) *Fr. trag. adesp.* 391 N.², is to be attributed to Aesch. *Δικτυωνίκος*; (ii) Aesch. *fr.* 455 N.², is to be attributed to Aristotle *περὶ παρομιῶν*. M. Sicherl, *De Somnii Scipionis textu constituendo: ii. Singillatim de quibusdam locis*: critical notes on 17 passages. G. Giangrande, *Conjectural emendations* at Xen. *Ephes.* i. 2. 6 Dalmyeda read ἐπὶ έπαρκενα; *A.P.* vi. 297. 3, τημόδε; vi. 299. 5, τ' Ἐρωΐτας; ix. 159, ηνάζετο; 544. 3, χλδη οἱ δεῖρη; 563. 6, ἀρχήστου; 746. 2, ὡς χλαρώς. D. MacDowell, *Leogoras at Ennea Hodoi*: refutes Raubitschek's argument (*R.M.* xcvi [1955], 261, n. 8) for a cleruchy led by Leogoras in 453/2.

CIII. I: 1960

E. Bickel, *Senecas Briefe 58 und 65—Das Antiochus-Posidonius-Problem*: in *Ep.* 58, Seneca is merely translating a Greek text based ultimately on Plato's *Timaeus*; in *Ep.* 65, he draws on the Stoic's theory of the *aīrōv*, and on that of Plato and Aristotle, and ends with a tirade against the body based on Sextius and his School. A. J. Beattie, *Nisaea and Minoa*: identifies Nisaea with H. Giōrgios, Minoa with Tichó and Trypika, and Poseidion with Palióastro. I. Opelt, *Zum Kaiserkult in der griechischen Dichtung*: the imperial cult did not have so great an effect on Greek as on Latin literature; only Oppian uses a dedicatory prooemium on the Latin model. The emperor is addressed not in the official or unofficial terminology of inscriptions and papyri, but with expressions used by Homer and Pindar of gods and kings. K. Schauenburg, *Herakles und Omphale*: discusses the monuments illustrating Herakles with Omphale, none of which is earlier than the fourth century. A high proportion of these come from south Italy. H. Lloyd-Jones, *Three Notes on Aeschylus' Agamemnon*: at 129, read πρόσθε τὰ and translate 'the many herds consisting of the people'; at 1056-7, read Ἔορτας and προφαγαῖ; at 1652, punctuate with a colon after πρόκωπος. O. Schönberger, *Leitmotivisch wiederholte Bilder bei Lucan*: the Land represents Caesar and the Water Pompey, so that images based on the conflict of the elements foreshadow the course of the conflict between the men. E. Vetter, *Zum altrömischen Festkalender*: at Varro, *R.R.* ii. 1, read ποιμένα λαῶν (*salvere iubeo*) and (*ut solent Lupi*) *calibus*; in *Fasti Ostiensis* (*C.I.L.* xiv. 4547) [ag]O.N.IND stands for *Agoniorum indicio* or *Agonia indicuntur*. W. Schmid, *Ad carmen sepulcrale Christianum ILCV 3427 Diehl* (=C.L.E. 783 Buecheler=C.I.L.

v. 7640): at line 6, read *ser(tae)que* or *ser(tis)que*. C. J. Herington, *The Exeter Manuscript of the OCTAVIA: a correction*: corrects his assertion in *R.M.* ci (1958), 365, that G omits lines 687-9, and corrects four other minor slips in that article.

*RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI
ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA*

N. S. XXXVIII (1960), 1

(1) C. Galavotti, *Considerazioni sul Dyscolos di Menandro*: Martin's readings and attributions create comic effects to suit modern taste at the expense of Menander's unity of character. A defence of Galavotti's own edition. The didascalia date is accepted as 316 and supported from internal evidence. (2) P. Frassinetti, *Per l'esegesi del Culex*: a number of manuscript readings are defended, in some cases with the aid of new punctuation. The following emendations are offered: v. 20 *futura* for *ventura*; v. 21 *secure* for *secura*; v. 119 *nescius aspiciens horror caecaverat artus*; v. 309 *indet* for *videre*; v. 371 *rupinis* for *rapidis*. (3) N. Marinone, *Cicerone, Paradoxa Stoicorum* 22 e 27: 22. The Stoic definition of Virtue demands that in the phrase *una virtus est, consentiens cum ratione et perpetua constantia, constantia* be nominative, qualified both by *consentiens cum ratione* and by *perpetua*; *constantia* is Cicero's translation, not of *εὐθάσεια*, but of the Stoic *διάθεσις*. 37. The solution of this *locus vexatissimus* is to take *ui* in *magna familia* by itself, and understand *stultorum* as partitive dependent on *aliis*. (68) L. Moretti, *Due iscrizioni latine inedite di Roma*: The T. Aius Sanctus whose career figures in the first inscription is to be identified with the *praefectus Aegypti* of c. 179-80, usually restored in the lists as Minucius Sanctus, and with the *orator* of Commodus named in the *Vita Commod.* 1. 6 as Ateius Sanctus. One of the two dedicators is described as *a pugione*, which provides strong support for Hirschfeld's view that *praef. praet. a pugione* (*Vita Commod.* 6. 12) was a genuine title. The second inscription shows a *damnatio memoriae* of Geta which extended to one of the dedicators.

N. S. XXXVIII (1960), 2

(113) G. Manganaro, *La Μάλητρου Σώσιος di Frinico e l'oracolo epico per Argo e Miletos*: the *ἀπά* pronounced on Phrynicus in 493 after the production of his *M. A.* was a punishment, not for reminding the Athenians how they had failed to save the Milesians, but for daring to warn them against resisting Persia. The play is a plea for appeasement on the same lines as the contemporary reply given by the Delphic oracle to Argos and Miletus. (124) Q. Cataudella, *Empedocles*: eight pas-

sages are dealt with (31 a, 55 a, 70 a, 72 a, 85 a, 26 b, 64 b, 137 b in Diels); contradictions and internal inconsistencies are removed, some by emendation, some by a return towards the manuscript readings. (133) G. Capovilla, *Riflessi italici del Miceneo B*: the second instalment concludes Capovilla's account of connexions between Italian and Mycenaean place-names, and presents a discursive treatment of prehistoric and protohistoric trade and colonization in the Mediterranean based on linguistic and archaeological evidence. (165) W. T. Avery, 'Culex' 174, *un emendamento: ingentem* for *ingens*, the hypermetrical syllable elided by synapheia with *adversum* in v. 175. Comparison with *Aen.* vi. 417-18 shows both that the word is *ingens* and not something else, and that it must be accusative. (170) L. Alfonsi, *Cicerone e i 'Lyrici'*: the statement attributed to Cicero by Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* 49. 5) *negat, si duplicitur sibi aetas, habiturum se tempus quo legat lyrics*, is not an attack on lyric poetry as such, but on its contemporary exponents, the *neoterici*.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES
FASC. XXXV (1959)

F. Pfister, *Studien zur Sagengeographie*: discusses the relationship of myth to reality in the *Wandering* motif in Alexander saga, with special reference to: Columns of Alexander, Caspian Gates, Island of Helios, River of the Sun. H. Herter, *Hera spricht mit Thetis*: Hera's speech (*Ap. Rhod. Arg.* iv. 778 ff.) is not composed of learned irrelevances; the details, especially regarding Planctae, Scylla, and Charybdis, are calculated to persuade Thetis by a psychological approach typical of Apollonius. K. Kleve, *Die 'Urbewegung' der epikureischen Atome und die Ewigkeit der Götter: clinamen* as well as Fall an original tendency of atoms; this explains how gods, though atomic, can also be everlasting. T. Carney, *Once again Marius' speech after election in 108 B.C.*: Marius' speech caused resentment because it parodied an optimist tomb *elegium* and involved a breach of *fides* towards Scipiones. H. Mörlund, *Ida (Aen. ix. 177)—Berg oder Nymphe?*: Ida a nymph invented by Virgil; the peculiarity of her having 'sent' Nisus explained as a reminiscence of v. 318, 491-2. H. L'Orange, *Ein Meisterwerk römischer Porträtkunst aus dem Jahrhundert der Soldatenkaiser*: an original life-size marble portrait bust in Oslo of a military commander of c. A.D. 250; possibly Decius. A. Seeberg, *Two pseudo-Seneca Replicas in Oslo*: adds two replicas to the 'Seneca' group and offers guesses at the identity of the original. W. Enslin, *Justinian I und die Patriarchate Rom u. Konstantinopel*:

traces events of 518–53 to show that J. aimed not merely at ascendancy over pope and patriarch but at a constitutional co-operation of Church and State. E. Skard, *Auge und Ohr bei Asterios Sophistes*: Ast. 51. 26–52. 9 illustrates the supremacy for Greeks of visual sense. S. Eitrem, *Textkritische Bemerkungen*: (1) Platonic passages showing confusion of *ω* with *οι*; (2) Notes on *Dyskolos*. V. Skånlund, *Tantundem. Benedicti reg. mon.*

e. 2: rejects Linderbauer's 'ebenso oft' and translates 'in the same way'. L. Sletsjøe, *La Pronunciation de l et n en Latin*: examines evidence for ancient grammarians' differing classifications of pronunciation of *l*: nasalization of *n* probably only at end of word or syllable.

A comprehensive index to Volumes i–xxxv (1922–59) and Supplements i–xvi has been separately published.

NOTES AND NEWS

The following unpublished writings of the late Professor W. B. Anderson have been placed in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge:

Lucan iv: translation (complete) and commentary (full to 331, scanty thereafter). Lucan v: translation (complete) and copious commentary throughout. A large introduction for an edition of Lucan, containing a detailed examination of the manuscript tradition. An interleaved copy of Hosius' edition (1892) with many annotations. A substantial quantity of other material relating to Lucan.

Statius, *Theb.* ii: notes for an introduction, translation to 570, copious commentary throughout.

Detailed notes on the *Culex* and its relationship to Virgil.

Lecture notes on the early poets and Virgil's debt to them; on Roman Tragedy; on the text of Catullus 1–63 (certain poems omitted); on Virgil, *Aen.* iv; on Livy's style, constructions, and vocabulary.

Any scholar wishing to make use of this material should write in the first instance to the Librarian.

From Educational Productions, Ltd., East Ardsley, Wakefield, we have received a set of six slides reproducing in colour the three Flemish pictures which introduce the works of Virgil in the Holkham manuscript 311. Similar reproductions from manuscripts in other collections are available and slides of a *Natural History* and a *Metamorphoses* from Holkham are being added to the series.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

Ashmole (B.) Cyriac of Ancona. (British Academy Italian Lecture, 1957.) Pp. 17; 16 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1960. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.

Astruc (C.), *Concasty* (M. L.) Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des Manuscrits: Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs. Troisième partie: Le Supplément Grec. Tom. iii: Nos. 901–1371. Pp. xiv + 789. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1960. Paper, 100 fr.

Aubonne (J.) Aristote: Politique, livres i

et ii. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. ccvi + 175 (partly double).

Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960. Paper, 21 fr.

Barbu (N. I.) Plutarch: Vieți Paralele. Studiu introductiv, traducere și note. Vol. i. Pp. xc + 524. Bucarest: Editura Științifică, 1960. Paper, lei 17.

Barbu (Z.) Problems of Historical Psychology. Pp. x + 222. London: Routledge, 1960. Cloth, 25s. net.

Barker (E.) The Political Thought of Plato

- and Aristotle. Pp. xxii+559. New York: Dover Publications, 1960. Stiff paper, \$1.85. [Reprint: first published 1906; revised 1918, 1947.]
- Beaujeu* (J.) *L'Incendie de Rome en 64 et les Chrétiens.* (Collection Latomus, xlvi.) Pp. 48. Brussels: Latomus, 1960. Paper, 75 B.fr.
- Bell* (R. C.) *Board and Table Games.* Pp. xxiv+208; 24 plates, 164 figs. London: Oxford University Press, 1960. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Bodnar* (E. W.) *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens.* (Collection Latomus, xlvi.) Pp. 256. Brussels: Latomus, 1960. Paper, 375 B.fr.
- Boura* (C. M.) *Palladas and Christianity.* (From Proc. of the British Academy, xlvi.) Pp. 13. London: Oxford University Press, 1960. Paper, 3s. net.
- British School at Rome.* Papers: Volume xxvii (1959). Pp. 185; 31 plates. London: British School at Rome, 1960. Cloth, £2. 10s. net.
- Broadhead* (H. W.) *The Persae of Aeschylus.* Pp. lxxiii+350. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Brown* (W. Ll.) *The Etruscan Lion.* Pp. xxvi+209; 64 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 84s. net.
- Buchheit* (V.) *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristoteles.* Pp. 260. Munich: Max Hüber, 1960. Paper, DM 29.80.
- Büchner* (K.) *Sallust.* Pp. 461. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960. Cloth, DM 19.80.
- Burn* (A.R.) *The Lyric Age of Greece.* Pp. xvi+422. London: Arnold, 1960. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Carpenter* (R.) *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art.* New Edition. Pp. 177. London: Mark Paterson (for Indiana University Press), 1960. Stiff paper, 14s. net.
- Carrington* (A. G.) *Aspects of Martial's Epigrams.* Pp. 125. Eton: Shakespeare's Head Press (for the University College of the West Indies), 1960. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Cronin* (G.), *Doyle* (P. A.) *Pope's Iliad: an Examination by William Melmoth.* Pp. v+57. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Paper, \$1.95.
- Cumont* (F.) *After Life in Roman Paganism.* Pp. xv+225. New York: Dover Publications, 1960. Stiff paper, \$1.35. [Reprint: first published 1922.]
- Dodds* (E. R.), *Theiler* (W.), *Hadot* (P.), *Puech* (H. P.), *Dörrie* (H.), *Cilento* (V.), *Harder* (R.), *Schwyzer* (H. R.), *Armstrong* (A. H.), *Henry* (P.) *Les Sources de Plotin.* (Entretiens Hardt, Tome v.) Pp. xiii+463. Cambridge: Heffer, 1960. Cloth, £2. 15s. net.
- Düring* (L.), *Owen* (G. E. L.) (ed.) *Aristotle and Plato in the Mid-Fourth Century.* Papers of the Symposium Aristotelicum held at Oxford in August, 1957. (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensis*, xi.) Pp. x+279. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1960. Paper, kr. 23.
- Evans* (E.) *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection.* Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary. Pp. xxxvi+361. London: S.P.C.K., 1960. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Gernet* (L.) *Démosthène: Plaidoyers Civils.* Tome iii (Discours xlix-lvi). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960. Paper, 15 fr.
- Giancotti* (F.) *L'ottimismo relativo nel De Rerum Natura di Lucrezio.* Pp. xxxii+219. Turin: Loescher, 1960. Paper, L 980.
- Grant* (M.) *Cicero: Selected Works.* A new translation. Pp. 272. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1960. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Grant* (M.) *The World of Rome.* Pp. xxi+322; 64 plates. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1960. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Grant* (M.), *Pottinger* (D.) *Romans.* Pp. 63; ill. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1960. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Gregor* (D. B.) *Sofoklo: Reĝo Edipo kaj Antigona. Enkonduko, elgrekigo kaj notoj.* Pp. 215. La Laguna: Régulo, 1960. Paper. [Esperanto translation with introductions.]
- Habrich* (E.) *Iamblichus Babyloniaca Reliquiae.* (Scr. Gr. et Rom. Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) Pp. xii+83. Leipzig: Teubner, 1960. Cloth, DM 6.60.
- Harder* (R.) *Plotins Schriften übersetzt. Neu bearbeitung mit griechischem Leertext und Anmerkungen fortgeführt von Rudolf Beutler und Willy Theiler.* Band v: *Die Schriften 46-54 der chronologischen Reihenfolge. (a) Text und Übersetzung, (b) Anmerkungen.* Pp. xii+546. Hamburg: Meiner, 1960. Cloth, DM 46.
- Harder* (R.) *Plotin: Ausgewählte Einzelschriften.* Übersetzt von R. H., herausgegeben von R. Beutler und W. Theiler. Heft 2: *Schriften 46, 51 und 54.* Studienausgabe. Pp. 84. Hamburg: Meiner, 1960. Paper, DM 5.60.
- Harmand* (L.) *L'Occident romain: Gaule—Espagne—Bretagne—Afrique du Nord (31 av. J.C. à 235 ap. J.C.).* Pp. 494. Paris: Payot, 1960. Paper, 28 fr.
- Hassler* (M.) *Die Bedeutung der Kyria-Klausel in den Papyrusurkunden.* (Berliner Juristische Abhandlungen, 3.) Pp. 126. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1960. Paper, DM 16.
- Hawthorn* (J. R.), *Macdonald* (C.) *Roman Politics, 80-44 B.C. A Selection of Latin*

- passages with historical commentary and notes. Pp. 259; 2 maps, 3 plans. London: Macmillan, 1960. Cloth, 9s. 6d.
- Henry (P.), Hadot (P.) Marius Victorinus: Traité théologique sur la Trinité. Texte établi par P. Henry, introduction, traduction, notes et commentaire par P. Hadot. (Sources Chrétienennes, 68-69.) 2 vols. Pp. 1168. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960. Paper, 49.50 fr.*
- Hodge (A. T.) The Woodwork of Greek Roofs. Pp. xvi+149; 16 plates, 23 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. Cloth, 50s. net.*
- Hoppenbrouwers (H.) La plus ancienne version latine de la vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase. Étude de critique textuelle. (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. 14.) Pp. xi+220. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1960. Paper, fl. 12.*
- Humphries (R.) The Satires of Juvenal translated. Pp. 186. London: Mark Patterson (for Indiana University Press), 1960. Stiff paper, 12s. net.*
- Jaeger (W.) Humanistische Reden und Vorträge. 2 Auflage. Pp. viii+335. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960. Cloth, DM 28.*
- Johnson (G.) The Pastorals of Vergil: a Verse Translation of the Eclogues. With an introduction and notes by L. R. Lind. Pp. 61. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1960. Cloth, \$3.*
- Jones (A. H. M.) Studies in Roman Government and Law. Pp. viii+243. Oxford: Blackwell, 1960. Cloth, 30s. net.*
- Kabiersch (J.) Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philanthropie bei dem Kaiser Julian. (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 21.) Pp. x+96. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960. Paper, DM 10.*
- Kahn (C. H.) Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology. Pp. xvii+250. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 52s. net.*
- Kemper (H. D.) Rat und Tat: Studien zur Darstellung eines antithetischen Begriffs-paars in der klassischen Periode der griechischen Literatur. (Bonn diss.) Pp. 124. Bonn: privately printed, 1960. Paper.*
- Kenna (V. E. G.) Cretan Seals: with a Catalogue of the Minoan Gems in the Ashmolean Museum. Pp. xiii+164; 23 plates, 172 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 105s. net.*
- Koestermann (E.) Cornelius Tacitus. Tom. i: Annales. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xl+451. Leipzig: Teubner, 1960. Cloth, DM 17.*
- Krämer (H. J.) Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles. Zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der platonischen Ontologie. (Abh. d. Heidelberg Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1959. 6.) Pp. 600. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960. Paper, DM 39.50.*
- Kramer (F.), Dittenberger (W.) Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico. 18. Auflage von H. Meusel. Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge von H. Oppermann. Band 1 (i-iv): Pp. viii+533, 3 plans, 1 map. Band 2 (v-vii): Pp. vi+696. Berlin: Weidmann, 1960. Cloth, DM 37, 39.*
- Kraus (W.) Menanders Dyskolos. Mit einem kritischen Kommentar herausgegeben. (Sitz. d. Öster. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., Band 234, Abh. 4.) Pp. 126. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1960. Paper, ö.S. 85.*
- Kullmann (W.) Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis). (Hermes-Einzel-schriften, 14.) Pp. xiv+407. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1960. Paper, DM 44.*
- Lasso de la Vega (J.S.) and others. El Mundo Clásico en el Pensamiento Español Contemporáneo. Pp. 157. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 1960. Paper, 70 ptas.*
- Lehmann (K.) Samothrace: a Guide to the Excavations and the Museum. Second revised edition. Pp. 106; 54 figs., plan. New York: New York University, Institute of Fine Arts, 1960. Paper, \$1.50.*
- Lenzen (V. F.) The Triumph of Dionysos on Textiles of Late Antique Egypt. (Publ. in Class. Archaeology, vol. 5, No. 1.) Pp. 38; 11 plates. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960. Paper.*
- Lochner-Hüttenbach (F.) Die Pelasger. Pp. v + 190. Vienna: Gerold & Co., 1960. Paper, ö.S. 100.*
- Luck (G.) (ed.) Horizonte der Humanitas. Eine Freundschaftsgabe für Professor Walter Wili zu seinem 60. Geburtstag. Pp. 197. Bern: Haupt, 1960. Cloth, 15.80 Sw. fr.*
- Luschütz (O.) Thucydidis Historiae. Vol. i (libri i-ii). Editio altera correctior. (Scr. Gr. et Rom. Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) Pp. 25*+213. Leipzig: Teubner, 1960. Cloth, DM 8.40.*
- Marót (K.) Die Anfänge der griechischen Literatur: Vorfragen. Pp. 528; 13 plates. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1960. Cloth.*
- Martin (J.), Hovingh (P. F.) Commodiani Carmina, Claudi Marii Victorii Alethia. (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, cxxviii.) Pp. xxxii+299. Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols, 1960. Paper, 325 B.fr.*
- Mattingly (H.) Roman Coins. From the earliest time to the fall of the Western Empire. Pp. xiii+303; 64 plates. London: Methuen, 1960. Cloth, 63s. net. [New*

- edition revised and reset: first published, 1928
(C.R. xlii. 142).*
- Melin (B.) Die Heimat der Kimbern.* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1960. 5.) Pp. 91. Uppsala: Lundeqvist, 1960. Paper, kr. 8.
- Merlan (P.) Studies in Epicurus and Aristotle.* (Klassisch Philologische Studien, 22.) Pp. 112. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960. Paper, DM 12.
- Mihăescu (H.) Limba latină în provinciile dunărene ale imperiului roman.* (Le latin des provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain.) Pp. 332. Bucarest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1960. Paper, lei 11.30.
- Morgan (M. H.) Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture translated.* Pp. xiii + 331; 68 ill. New York: Dover Publications (London: Constable), 1960. Stiff paper, \$2. [Reprint: first published (Harvard University Press), 1914.]
- Oliver (J. H.) Demokratia, the Gods and the Free World.* Pp. ix + 192. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Opuscula Romana.* Vol. ii. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 4^o, xx.) Pp. 122; 38 plates. Lund: Gleerup, 1960. Paper, kr. 60.
- Parkes (H. B.) Gods and Men. The Origins of Western Culture.* Pp. xii + 489 + vii. London: Routledge, 1960. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Pearson (L.) The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great.* (Philological Monographs, xx.) Pp. xv + 275. New York: American Philosophical Association (Oxford: Blackwell), 1960. Cloth, \$8.
- Perry (B. E.) The Origin of the Book of Sinbad.* Pp. 94. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960. Paper.
- Phloratos (C. S.) 'Η προφητεία τοῦ Π. Nigidius Figulus (Luc. i. 639-73).* Pp. 50. Athens: privately printed, 1958. Paper.
- Prichett (W. K.) Marathon.* (Publ. in Class. Archaeology, vol. 4, No. 2.) Pp. 54; 12 plates, map. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960. Paper.
- Proudfoot (L.) Dryden's Aeneid and its Seventeenth-Century Predecessors.* Pp. vii + 279. Manchester: University Press, 1960. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Quacquarelli (A.) Rethorica e liturgica antenica.* Pp. xxviii + 341. Rome: Desclée, 1960. Paper, L. 3,500.
- Randall (J. H.) Aristotle.* Pp. xv + 309. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Raphael (D. D.) The Paradox of Tragedy.* (The Mahlon Powell Lectures, 1959.) Pp. 112. London: Allen & Unwin, 1960. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Redfors (J.) Echtheitskritische Untersuchung der apuleischen Schriften De Platone und De Mundo.* Pp. 122. Lund: Gleerup, 1960. Paper, kr. 15.
- Reiche (H. A. T.) Empedocles' Mixture, Eudoxian Astronomy and Aristotle's Conitate Pneuma.* Pp. 148. Amsterdam: Hakker, 1960. Cloth, fl. 18.
- Richter (G. M. A.) Greek Portraits.* iii. (Collection Latomus, xlvi.) Pp. 60; 50 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1960. Paper, 150 B.fr.
- Rochefort (G.) Saloustios: Des dieux et du monde. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. li + 61 (partly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960. Paper, 9 fr.
- Schachermeyr (F.) Griechische Geschichte.* Pp. 470; 17 plates, 44 figs., 6 plans. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960. Cloth, DM 36.
- Schadewaldt (W.) Neue Kriterien zur Odyssee-Analyse: die Wiedererkennung des Odysseus und der Penelope.* (Sitz. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1959. 2.) Pp. 28. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960. Paper, DM 5.60.
- Schetter (W.) Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius.* (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 20.) Pp. viii + 157. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960. Paper, DM. 14.
- Schreckenberg (H.) Δράμα: vom Werden der griechischen Tragödie aus dem Tanz.* Eine philologische Untersuchung. Pp. 144. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1960. Paper.
- Schröter (R.) Studien zur varronischen Etymologie. Erster Teil.* (Akad. der Wiss. in Mainz, Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Kl., 1959.12.) Pp. 118. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1960. Paper, DM. 11.20.
- Schwartz (W.) Gesammelte Schriften, Band iv: Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und ihres Rechts.* Pp. xi + 344. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960. Cloth, DM 44.
- Sedgwick (W. B.) Plautus: Amphitruo.* Edited with introduction and notes. Pp. vi + 138. Manchester: University Press, 1960. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Severyns (A.) Grèce et Proche-Orient avant Homère.* Pp. 242. Brussels: Office de Publicité, 1960. Stiff paper, 225 B.fr.
- Spira (A.) Untersuchungen zum Deus ex machina bei Sophokles und Euripides.* (Frankfurt diss.) Pp. 167. Kallmünz: Verlag Lassleben, 1960. Paper, DM 12.
- Steinmetz (P.) Theophrast: Charaktere.* Herausgegeben und erklärt. Band i: Textgeschichte und Text. (Das Wort der Antike, vii.) Pp. 106. Munich: Hüber, 1960. Paper, DM 12.80.

- Stoessl (F.) Personenwechsel in Menanders Dyskolos. (Sitz. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., Bd. 234, Abh. 5.) Pp. 91. Vienna: Röhrer, 1960. Paper, ös. 60.
- Street (J. M.), Chenevix-Trench (A.) Rome, 753 B.C.-A.D. 180. A Short History for Secondary Schools. Pp. viii+320; maps. Glasgow: Blackie, 1960. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Susini (G.) Il lapidario greco e romano di Bologna. Pp. xv+194. Bologna: Comune di Bologna, Museo Civico, 1960. Paper.
- Sweet (W. E.) Vergil's Aeneid: a Structural Approach. Vol. 1: Books i and ii with a Latin Interpretation and Selected Notes from Servius. Pp. vii+163. London: Angus & Robertson (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press), 1960. Paper, 17s. 6d.
- Taylor (A. E.) Plato: The Laws. Translated with an Introduction. (Everyman's Library, 275.) Pp. lxvii+380. London: Dent, 1960. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net. [Reprint: first published, 1934.]
- Tcherikover (V. A.), Fuks (A.) Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum. Volume ii. Pp. xvi+283. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 96s. net.
- Thesleff (H.) Yes and No in Plautus and Terence. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Literarum, xxvi. 3.) Pp. 83. Helsinki: Academic Bookstore (Copenhagen: Munksgaard), 1960. Paper, mk. 420.
- Thiefelder (H.) Die Geschwisterere im hellenistisch-römischen Ägypten. (Fontes et Commentationes, Heft 1.) Pp. 102. Münster: Aschendorff, 1960. Paper, DM 9.50.
- Thomas (P. H.) Incerti auctoris epitoma rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xv+52. Leipzig: Teubner, 1960. Cloth, DM 4.
- Thomasson (B. E.) Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus. 2 vols. (Skr. utg. av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 8°, ix, 1, 2.) Pp. 107, 336. Lund: Gleerup, 1960. Paper, kr. 20, 60.
- Thomson (G. S.) and Craddock (C. H.) Latin: a four-year course to G.C.E. Ordinary Level. Book 2. Pp. xi+330. Glasgow: Blackie, 1960. Boards, 9s. 6d.
- Tränkle (H.) Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache. (Hermes-Einzelschriften, 15.) Pp. viii+190. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1960. Paper, DM 16.
- Trenkner (S.) Le Style καί dans le récit attique oral. Pp. xii+83. Assen (Netherlands): van Gorcum, 1960. Paper, fl. 8.50.
- Trianaphulopoulos (I. K.) Lex Ciceria: 2. Praejudicium. Pp. xv+165. Athens: Kleisioumios, 1959. Paper.
- Ullman (B. L.) The Origin and Development of Humanistic Script. Pp. 146; 70 ill. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1960. Paper, L. 4,000.
- Ussher (R. G.) The Characters of Theophrastus. Edited with introduction, commentary and index. Pp. xiv+296. London: Macmillan, 1960. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Van Groningen (B. A.) Le Dyscolos de Ménandre. Étude critique du texte. (Verh. der K. Nederlandse Akad. Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. lxvii. 3.) Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij, 1960. Paper, fl. 40.
- van Son (D. W. L.) Livius' Behandeling van de Bacchanalia. (Amsterdam diss.) Pp. 211. Privately printed, 1960. Paper.
- Vellacott (P.) Menander: The Bad-Tempered Man. Translated into English, with a foreword by Christopher Fry. Pp. xxi+50. London: Oxford University Press, 1960. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Vermeule (C. C.) The Dal Pozzo-Albani Drawings of Classical Antiquities in the British Museum. (Trans. of the Amer. Philosophical Society, vol. 50, part 5.) Pp. 38; 104 figs. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1960. Paper, \$2.
- Vicaire (P.) Platon: critique littéraire. (Études et Commentaires, xxxiv.) Pp. 448. Paris: Klincksieck, 1960. Paper, 36 fr.
- von Vacano (O. W.) The Etruscans in the Ancient World. Pp. 195; 16 plates, 38 figs. London: Arnold, 1960. Cloth, 30s. net.
- White (H. A. B.) Latin Scansion for Schools. Pp. vi+98. Glasgow and London: Blackie, 1960. Limp, 5s.
- Wimmel (W.) Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit. (Hermes Einzelschriften, 16.) Pp. viii+344. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1960. Paper, DM 32.
- Woodhead (A. G.) Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Volumen xvii. Pp. xiv+244. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1960. Paper.
- Yaron (R.) Gifts in Contemplation of Death in Jewish and Roman Law. Pp. xiv+250. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 35s. net.

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Adams's *Sophocles the Playwright*, 21
Adkins (A. W. H.) on Ferguson's *Moral Values in the Ancient World*, 50
Adriani's *Divagazioni intorno ad una coppa paesistica del museo di Alessandria*, 268
Aetolian embassy to Rome at start of Second Macedonian War, 9
Altheim's *Römische Geschichte* (III) 2nd edition, 62
Anderson (the late W. B.), unpublished writings of, 273
André's *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle*, XIV, 39; his *Notes de lexicographie botanique grecque*, 123
antrum used hyperbolically, 100
aquila senectus, 186 ff.
ara Tarenti, 8
Armstrong (A. H.) on Dörrie's *Porphyrios' Εὐμάκτα Ζηρίπωνα*, 220; on Henry-Schwyzer's *Plotinus* (II), 221
Arnott's *Introduction to the Greek Theatre*, 207
Astin's *The Lex Annalis before Sulla*, 176
Atti del Convegno Internazionale ovidiano, 1958: 222
Badian (E.) on Astin's *The Lex Annalis before Sulla*, 176
Bailey's *Roman Life and Letters*, 252; his *Examination Papers in Latin*, 253
Baldry (H. C.) on Lattimore's *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy*, 26; on Flashar's *Der Dialog als Zeugnis platonischer Philosophie*, 113; on Bonnard's *Greek Civilization*, 264
Baldson (J. P. V. D.) on Volkmann's *Cleopatra*, 68; on Durry and others' *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité*, 151
Bambrough (J. R.) on Courcier's and others' *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne*, 29; on Cushman's *Therapeia*, 115; on Friedländer's *Plato*, 117
Barber (E. A.) on Schuster-Dornseiff's *Propertius*, 77
Bartoletti's *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 2nd edition, 209
Beattie (A. J.) on Porzig's *Die Gliederung des Indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*, 243
Bell (H. L.) on Kraemer's *Excavations at Nessana* (III), 33
Bengtson's *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*, 263
Biliński's *Accio ed i Gracchi*, 169
Bingen's *Menander, Dyscolos*, 204
Bishop (J. H.) The Ghost of a *Longaeus Paren*, 8
Blatt's *The Latin Josephus* (I), 44
Boer's *Pauli Alexandrini Etoaywuká*, 217
Böhme's *Bühnenbearbeitung Aschyliques Tragödien*, 198
Bolaffi's *La critica filosofica e letteraria in Quintiliano*, 80
Bolgar (R. R.) on Wind's *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, 75
Bonnard's *Greek Civilization*, 264
BOOKS RECEIVED, 87, 181, 273
Booth (N. B.) *Sophocles, OT* 230-2: 7
Bowra (C. M.) *The Fate of Gessius*, 91
Boyd (M. J.) on Le Bonniec's *Le Culte de Cérès*, 147
Brandenstein's *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft* (II), 140
Brelich's *Gli eroi greci*, 48
Brison's *L'Autonomisme et Christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine*, 162
Brower and others' *On Translation*, 237
Browning (R.) An Unnoticed Fragment of Sappho⁵, 192; on Eisenhut's *Dicthy Creensis*, 40; on Guaglianone's *Avianus, Fabulae*, 42; on Blatt's *The Latin Josephus* (I), 44; on Norberg's *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, 46; on Corbett's *The Latin of the Regula Magistri*, 172; on Hiltbrunner's *Latina Graeca*, 173; on Löfstedt's *Latin Latin*, 235
Brunt (P. A.) on Dienelt's *Die Friedenspolitik des Perikles*, 157; on Bengtson's *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*, 263
Buchner's *Der Panegyrikus des Isokrates*, 31
Budé Texts: Cicero, *de Legibus*, 228; (Josephus, *Vita*, 258;) Pliny, *NH* XIV, 39; Sophocles (II), 16
Bulmer-Thomas (I.) on Mugler's *Dictionnaire historique de la terminologie géométrique des grecs*, 121; on Boer's *Pauli Alexandrini Etoaywuká*, 217
Cardini's *Pitagorici* (I), 15
Cawkwell (G. L.) on Fuller's *The Generalship of Alexander the Great*, 57; on Hampl's *Alexander der Große*, 80
Chadwick (H.) on van der Meer-Mohrmann's *Atlas of the Early Christian World*, 82; on Schwartz's *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*, 264
Clarke (M. L.) on Pease's *Ciceronis De Natura Deorum II et III*, 130; on Wistrand's *Horace's Ninth Epoede*, 136
Clarke's *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900*, 166
Clay's *Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides* (II), 77
Coccia's *I problemi del 'De Ira' di Seneca*, 171
Cohen and Drabkin's *Source Book in Greek Science*, 250
coins, 177
Cook (J. M.) on Dugas-Flacelière's *Thésée, Images et Récits*, 81; on Richter's *Handbook of Greek Art*, 177; on Herrmann's *Omphalos*, 266; on Lehmann's *Samothrace* (I), 267; on Robinson's *The Athenian Agora* (V), 267

- Cook (R. M.)** on Hood's *Archaeological Survey of the Knossos Area*, 175
Cooper's Journey to Hesperia, 252
Copley's Terence's Phormio, 169
Corbett's The Latin of the Regula Magistri, 172
Courcelle and others' Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne, 29
Courtney (E.) Notes on Cicero, 95
Cuff (P. J.) on Sirago's *L'Italia agraria sotto Traiano*, 161
Cushman's Therapeia, 115
- Dain-Mazon's *Sophocle* (II), 16
Dale (A. M.) The Transformation of Io, 194; on Dain-Mazon's *Sophocle* (II), 16
Davison (J. A.) Archilochus, fr. 2 Diehl, 1; on Myres's *Homer and his Critics*, 108; on Matthes's *Odysseus bei den Phaiakien*, 168; on Snell, Fleischer, and Mette's *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (III), 195
DeLacy-Einarson's Plutarch's Moralia (VII), 214
Deonna's Un divertissement de table 'A cloche-pied', 265; his *Mercure et le scorpion*, 266
de Plinval's Cicéron, Traité des Lois, 228
Diano's Menandro, *Dyskolas ouvert sous il Selvatico*, and *Note in margine al Dyskolas di Menandro*, 204
Dienelt's Die Friedenspolitik des Perikles, 157
Dioniso summarized (XX 3-4, XXI 1-4, XXII 1-2), 83 f.
Dorey (T. A.) The alleged Actolian embassy to Rome, 9
Dörrie's Porphyrios' Σύμπτυχα Ζητήματα, 220
Douglas (A. E.) on Bolaffi's *La critica filosofica e letteraria in Quintiliano*, 80; on Schmid's *Über die klassische Theorie und Praxis des antiken Prosarhythmus*, 131; on Neuhauser's *Patronus und Orator*, 133
Dover (K. J.) on Lasserre-Bonnard's *Archiloque, Les Fragments*, 10; on Kleinlogel's *Beobachtungen zu einigen 'recentiores' des Thukydides*, 28; on Moorhouse's *Studies in the Greek Negatives*, and Koppers's *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek*, 241
Duff's Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age, 179
Dugas-Flacelière's Thésée, Images et Récits, 81
Dumbarton Oaks Papers (XII), 81
Durand's La Poesia di Orazio, 261
Durry and others' Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité, 151
- Edmonds's *Fragments of Attic Comedy* (II), 202
Eichholz (D. E.) on André's *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle*, XIV, 39; on Moritz's *Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity*, 73; on André's *Notes de lexicographie botanique grecque*, 123; on Scholfield's *Aelian, On Animals* (II), 219; on Sarton's *History of Science* (II), and Cohen and Drabkin's *Source Book in Greek Science*, 250
Eisenhut's Dictys Cretensis, 40
Entretiens Hardi (III), 29; (IV), 151
Eranos summarized (LVII 1-2), 84
- Fehrle-Hünnerkopf's *Tacitus, Germania*, 234
- Ferguson's *Moral Values in the Ancient World*, 50
Flashar's Der Dialog Ion als Zeugnis platonischer Philosophie, 113
Fondation Hardt, guest-rooms offered by, 87
Fortina's Epaminonda, 159
Fraser (P. M.) on *Supplementum Epigraphum Graecum* (XV), 79
Freud (W. H. C.) on Brisson's *L'Automatisme et Christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine*, 162
Friedländer's Plato, 117
Frisk's Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (VII-VIII), 253
Fuller's The Generalship of Alexander the Great, 57
functus, 6
- Gardner's *Cicero, Pro Sestio etc., and Pro Caelio etc.*, 37
Garuti's Rabirius, Bellum Actiacum, 138
Gerundive with ab, 189 ff.
Gessius, 91 ff.
Gordons' Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions (I) and *Contributions to the Paleography of Latin Inscriptions*, 64
Gray (D. H. F.) on Mireaux's *Daily Life in the Time of Homer*, 197
Grene and Lattimore's Complete Greek Tragedies, Euripides (III-IV), 256
Griffith (J. G.) A Gerundive in Juvenal, 189
Griffiths (J. Gwyn) Horace, AP 372-3: 104
Grollios's Seneca's ad Marciam, 171
Gschnitzer's Abhängige Orte im griechischen Altertum, 52
Guaglianone's Avianus, Fabulae, 42
Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Rudhardt's *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse dans la Grèce classique*, 145; on Rose's *Some Problems of Classical Religion*, 178
- Hammond (N. G. L.)** on Gschnitzer's *Abhängige Orte im griechischen Altertum*, 52; on Philipsson-Kirsten's *Die griechischen Landschaften* (II 2), 60
Hampl's Alexander der Große, 80
Harmand's Le Patronat sur les collectivités publiques, 66
Harrison (A. R. W.) on Masaracchia's *Solone*, 156
Harrison (E. L.) Neglected Hyperbole in Juvenal, 99
Helm's Tibull, 137
Henry-Schwyzer's Plotinus (II), 221
Herrmann's Omphalos, 266
Heubeck's Lydiaka, 245
Higham (T. F.) on Brower and others' *On Translation*, 237
Hijmans's Ακτορις, Notes on Epictetus' Educational System, 238
Hiltbrunner's Latina Graeca, 173
Hood's Archaeological Survey of the Knossos Area, 175
Hopper (R. J.) on Michell's *Economics of Ancient Greece*, 175

- Hudson-Williams (A.)** on Rapisarda's *Orientii Communitorum*, 78
- Hudson-Williams (H. L.)** on Buchner's *Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates*, 31; on Lesky's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 124
- Huxley (H. H.)** Claudian, *de Raptu Proserpinae*, II 163-9; 8
- Hyperbole in Juvenal, 99 ff.
- Io, transformation of, 194 f.
- Irigoin's *Les Scholies métaphysiques de Pindare*, 12
- Jachmann's *Der homerische Schiffskatalog und die Ilias*, 105
- Johansen's *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis*, 255
- Jones (A. H. M.)** on Pelletier's *Josephus, Autobiographie*, 258
- Jones (D. Mervyn)** on Edmonds's *Fragments of Attic Comedy* (II), 202
- Jones (D. M.)** on Brandenstein's *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft* (II), 140; on Svennung's *Anredeformen*, 142; on Pulgram's *The Tongues of Italy*, 143; on *Minoica*, 154; on *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 174; on Heubeck's *Lydiaka*, 245; on Frisk's *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (VII-VIII), 253; on Pavano's *Introduzione alla lingua etrusca*, 262
- Kauer's *Die Geburt der Athena im altgriechischen Epos*, 254
- Kemball-Cook (B. H.)** on some school books, 252
- Kennedy and Tilley's *Trojan Aeneas*, 252
- Kennedy's *Caesar, De Bello Gallico III and VII*, 252
- Kenney (E. J.)** on Garuti's *Rabirius, Bellum Actiacum*, 138; on Syndicus's *Lucanus Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg*, 139; on *Atti del Convegno Internazionale ovidiano*, 1958: 222; on Luck's *The Latin Love Elegy*, 224
- Kerferd (G. B.)** on Cardini's *Pitagorici* (I), 15; on Untersteiner's *Parmenide*, 111; on Zafiropulo's *Vox Zenonis*, 112; on Lieberg's *Die Lehre von der Lust in den Ethiken des Aristoteles*, 118; on Wehrli's *Die Schule des Aristoteles* (X), 211; on Quiring's *Heraklit*, 257; on Hijmans's *Axkopos, Notes on Epictetus' Educational System*, 258
- Kirkwood's *Study of Sophoclean Drama*, 19
- Kitto's *Sophocles, Dramatist and Philosopher*, 23
- Klaassenbach's *Varia Epigraphica*, 176
- Kleinlogel's *Beobachtungen zu einigen 'recensiones' des Thukydides*, 28
- Klingner's *Horatius*, 3rd edition, 262
- Knox's *In Three Tongues*, 263
- Koppers's *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek*, 241
- Körte-Thierfelder's *Menander* (II), 2nd edition, 256
- Krasay (C. M.)** on Noe's *The Coinage of Caulonia*, 177
- Kraemer's *Excavations at Nessana* (III), 33
- Kraner - Hoffmann - Meusel - Oppermann's *Caesar, Bellum Civile*, 226
- Lacey (W. K.)** on Harmand's *Le Patronat sur les collectivités publiques*, 66
- Lasserre-Bonnard's *Archiloque, Les Fragments*, 10
- Lattimore's *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy*, 26
- Leach (C.)** on Knox's *In Three Tongues*, 263
- Le Bonnec's *Le Culte de Cérès*, 147
- Lehmann's *Samothrace* (I), 267
- Lesky's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 124
- Liburna*, 101
- Lieberg's *Die Lehre von der Lust in den Ethiken des Aristoteles*, 118
- Lloyd-Jones (H.)** on Pfleiderer's *Ein neues Inachos-Fragment des Sophokles*, 25; on Körte-Thierfelder's *Menander* (II), 256
- Loeb Classical Library: Aelian (II), 219; Cicero, *Pro Sestio, In Vatinium, and Pro Caelio, De Prov. Cons., Pro Balbo*, 37; Livy (XIV), 229; Plutarch, *Moralia* (X), 214
- Löfstedt's *Roman Literary Portraits*, 35; his *Late Latin*, 235
- Lorimer (W. L.)** Plato, *Phaedo* 84 c: 7
- Lucas (D. W.)** on Kirkwood's *Study of Sophoclean Drama*, 19; on Clay's *Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides* (II), 77; on Böhme's *Bühnenbearbeitung Äschylischer Tragödien*, 198; on Maddalena's *Sofocle*, 200; on Arnott's *Introduction to the Greek Theatre*, 207; on Johansen's *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis*, 255; on Grene and Lattimore's *Complete Greek Tragedies, Euripides* (III-IV), 256
- Luck's *The Latin Love Elegy*, 224
- McDonald (A. H.)** on Schlesinger's *Livy* (XIV), 229; on Scullard's *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 247
- Macleod (M. D.)** A Homeric Parody in Lucian, 103
- McKay (K. J.)** Callimachus, *Hymn VI* 88: 102
- Maddalena's *Sofocle*, 200
- magmentarium, 98
- Maginness (W. S.)** on Löfstedt's *Roman Literary Portraits*, 35; on Stégen's *Les Épîtres littéraires d'Horace*, 170
- Martin (R. H.)** on Wuilleumier's *Tacite, Histoires I*, 230; on Miller's *Tacitus, Annals I*, 232; on Fehrle-Hünnerkopf's *Tacitus, Germania*, 234
- Masarachia's *Solone*, 156
- Mattes's *Odysseus bei den Phäaken*, 168
- Mattingly (H. B.)** on Biliński's *Accio ed i Gracchi*, 169
- Mauls and Smith's *Votive Religion at Caere, Prolegomena*, 269
- Mette's *Menandros, Dyskolos*, 204
- Michell's *Economics of Ancient Greece*, 2nd edition, 175
- Miller's *Tacitus, Annals I*, 232
- Minoica*, 154
- Mireaux's *Daily Life in the Time of Homer*, 197
- Mnemosyne* summarized (4th S. XII 2-4), 85; (XIII 1), 180; (XIII 2), 270
- mons used hyperbolically, 99 f.
- Moorhouse's *Studies in the Greek Negatives*, 241
- Moritz's *Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity*, 73

- at sur
nents,
26
263
124
hiken
neues
on
56
219;
Pro
Livy
214
his

y of
occa-
bides
tung
fadi-
ducia-
en's
on
Greek

Livy
cchi
in
88:

nan
Les
ite,
tus,
of's

d i
re,

nd

97
5;

41
cal
- Morris's *Advanced Latin Tests*, 253
Mouraux's *Une imprécation funéraire à Néocésarée*, 269
Mugler's *Dictionnaire historique de la terminologie géométrique des grecs*, 121
Müller's *Das Original des plautinischen Persa*, 128
Murray's *An Unfinished Autobiography*, 179
Mutschmann-Mau's *Sextus Empiricus* (I), 120
Myrc's *Homer and his Critics*, 108
Nash-Williams's *Advanced Level Greek Prose Composition and Key to Advanced Level Greek Prose Composition*, 253
Neuhauser's *Patronus und Orator*, 133
Neumann's *Die poetische Gerechtigkeit in der neuen Komödie*, 168
Nisbet (R. G. M.) Cicero, *Philippics* II 103; 103; on Gardner's *Cicero, Pro Sestio etc.* and *Pro Caelio etc.*, 37; on de Plinval's *Ciceron, Traité des Lois*, 228
Noe's *The Coinage of Caulonia*, 177
Norberg's *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, 46
Olympic Festival of 324 B.C., 185 ff.
Opstelten's *Beschouwigen naar aanleiding van het ontbreken van ons ethisch wijsbegrip in de oud-griekse ethiek*, 258
Paap's *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.*, 259
Page (D. L.) on Jachmann's *Der homerische Schiffskatalog und die Ilias*, 105; on Kauer's *Die Geburt der Athene im altgriechischen Epos*, 254
Paladini's *A proposito della tradizione poetica sulla battaglia di Azio*, 78
papyri, 25, 33, 138, 194, 209 f., 215 ff., 259
Pavano's *Introduzione alla lingua etrusca*, 262
Pavan's *La grecità politica da Tucidide ad Aristotele*, 59
Pease's *Ciceronis De Natura Deorum II et III*, 130
Pelletier's *Josephus, Autobiographie*, 258
Pfeiffer's *Ein neues Inachos-Fragment des Sophokles*, 25
Philipsson-Kirsten's *Die griechischen Landschaften* (II 2), 60
Picard's *Les Trophées romains*, 71
pila, 104
Platnauer (M.) Herodotus VI 72: 102
Porzig's *Die Gliederung des Indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*, 243
postic, 104
Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, 174
Pulgram's *The Tongues of Italy*, 143
Quincey and others' *Notes on the Dyskolos of Menander*, 204
Quiring's *Heraklit*, 257
Rapisarda's *Orientii Commonitorium*, 78
Rees (B. R.) on Paap's *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.*, 259; on Weitzmann's *Ancient Book Illumination*, 260
Rees, Bell, and Barns's *The Merton Papyri* (II), 215
Reeves's *Horrenda*, 252
Revue de Philologie summarized (XXXIII 2), 86; (XXXIV 1), 271
Reynolds (J. M.) on Gordon's *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions* (I), and *Contributions to the Paleography of Latin Inscriptions*, 64
Reynolds (L. D.) on Coccia's *I problemi del 'De Ira' di Seneca*, and on Grollius's *Seneca's ad Marciam*, 171
Rheinisches Museum summarized (CII 4, CIII 1), 271
Richmond's *Roman and Native in North Britain*, 164
Richter's *Handbook of Greek Art*, 177
Rieu's *Apollonius of Rhodes, The Voyage of Argo*, 256
Rivista di Filologia summarized (N.S. XXXVII 3-4), 86; (XXXVIII 1-2), 272
Robertson (D. S.) Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 22-24; 102; Tacitus, *Annals* I 32 again, 9; on Irigoin's *Les Scholies métriques de Pindare*, 12; on Snell's *Pindar* (I), 254
Robinson's *The Athenian Agora* (V), 267
Roebuck's *Nepos, Three Lives*, 252
Rose (H. J.) on Brelich's *Gli eroi greci*, 48; on Opstelten's *Beschouwigen naar aanleiding van het ontbreken van ons ethisch wijsbegrip in de oud-griekse ethiek*, 258; on Deonna's *Un divertissement de table 'A cloche-pied'*, 265; on Deonna's *Mercure et le scorpion*, 266; on Maule and Smith's *Votive Religion at Caere, Prolegomena*, 269; on Mouraux's *Une imprécation funéraire à Néocésarée*, 269
Rose (K. F. C.) Tacitus, *Annals* XV 44 3-8; 195
Rose's *Some Problems of Classical Religion*, 178
Rudhardt's *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse dans la Grèce classique*, 145
Runciman (S.) on Dumbarton Oaks Papers (XII), 81
Sandbach (F. H.) on Paladini's *A proposito della tradizione poetica sulla battaglia di Azio*, 78; on Helm's *Tibull*, 137; on some texts and discussions on Menander's *Dyscolos*, 204; on DeLacy-Einarson's *Pliarch's Moralia* (VII), 214
Sarton's *History of Science* (II), 250
Schlesinger's *Livy* (XIV), 229
Schmid's *Über die klassische Theorie und Praxis des antiken Prosarhythmus*, 131
Scholfield's *Aelian, On Animals* (II), 219
Schuster-Dornseiff's *Propertius*, 77
Schwartz's *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*, 264
Scullard's *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 247
Sealey (B. R. L.) The Olympic Festival of 324 B.C., 185
Sellman's *Roman Britain*, 253
Simon (J. H.) on Kraner-Hofmann-Meusel-Oppermann's *Caesar, Bellum Civile*, 226
Sinclair (T. A.) on Pavan's *La grecità politica da Tucidide ad Aristotele*, 59
Sirago's *L'Italia agraria sotto Traiano*, 161
Slides reproducing pictures from manuscripts, 273

- Snell, Fleischer and Mette's *Lexikon des fröhlichsten Epos* (III), 195
 Snell's *Pindar* (I), 3rd edition, 254
 Sordi's *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno*, 55
Staveley (E. S.) on Altheim's *Römische Geschichte* (III), 62
Stégen's *Les Épîtres littéraires d'Horace*, 170
Stevens (P. T.) on Adams's *Sophocles the Playwright*, 21; on Kitto's *Sophocles, Dramatist and Philosopher*, 23
Stokes (M. C.) *Parmenides*, fr. 6: 193
 Storr's *Ad Pyrrham*, 194
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 83, 180, 270
 Sundwall (J.), Festschrift for eightieth Birthday of, 154
Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (XV), 79
 Svennung's *Anreformen*, 142
Symbolae Östrolenses summarized (XXXV), 272
Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae (II-III), 270
 Syndikus's *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg*, 139
 Taubenschlag (R.) Festschrift for (II-III), 270
 Teubner Texts: *Dictys Cretensis*, 40; *Horace* (3rd edition), 262; *Menander* (II), 256; *Paulus Alexandrinus*, 217; *Pindar, Epinicia*, 254; *Propertius*, 77; *Sextus Empiricus* (I), 120
 Thompson and Craddock's *Latin*, 252
Townend (G. B.) *Aquilae Senectus*, 186
Toynbee (J. M. G.) on Picard's *Les Trophées romains*, 71; on Richmond's *Roman and Native in North Britain*, 164; on Adriani's *Divagazioni intorno ad una coppa paesistica del museo di Alessandria*, 268
Trypanis (C. A.) on Rieu's *Apollonius of Rhodes, The Voyage of Argo*, 256
Turner (E. G.) on Rees, Bell, and Barns's *The Merton Papyri* (II), 215
 Untersteiner's *Parmenide*, 111
 van der Meer-Mohrmann's *Atlas of the Early Christian World*, 82
 Ventris Memorial Fund, applications for award from, 180
 Volkmann's *Cleopatra*, 68
 Wade-Gery's *Essays in Greek History*, 54
 Walter's *Vom Sinnwandel griechischer Mythen*, 265
Wasserman (A.) Note on Anaxagoras, fr. 12: 4; on Mutschmann-Mau's *Sextus Empiricus* (I), 120; on Westerink's *Damascus, Lectures on the Philebus*, 212
 Webster's *The Birth of Modern Comedy*, 204
Webster (T. B. L.) on Walter's *Vom Sinnwandel griechischer Mythen*, 265
 Wehrli's *Die Schule des Aristoteles* (X), 211
 Weitzmann's *Ancient Book Illumination*, 260
 Westerink's *Damascus, Lectures on the Philebus*, 212
Westlake (H. D.) on Wade-Gery's *Essays in Greek History*, 54; on Sordi's *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno*, 55; on Fortina's *Epaminonda*, 159; on Bartoletti's *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 209
Wilkinson (L. P.) on Storr's *Ad Pyrrham*, 134; on Durand's *La Poesia di Orazio*, 261
Williams (G. W.) on Muller's *Das Original der plautinischen Persa*, 128; on Neumann's *Die poetische Gerechtigkeit in der neuen Komödie*, 168; on Copley's *Terence's Phormio*, 169
Williams (R. D.) *Horace, Odes IV* 15 29: 6
 Wind's *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, 75
 Wistrand's *Horace's Ninth Episode*, 136
Woodhead (A. G.) on Klaffenbach's *Varia Epigraphica*, 176
Wright (T. E.) on Klingner's *Horatius*, 262
 Wuilleumier's *Tacite, Histoires I*, 230
Young (D. C. C.) on Clarke's *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900*, 166
 Zafiropolo's *Vox Zenonis*, 112

II. INDEX LOCORUM

- Aelian *VH* xiv 18: 185
 Aeschylus *A.* 22-24, 281 f.: 102. *Pers.* 411: 3.
PV 478 ff., 102: 103
 Ammianus Marcellinus xxix 1 29 ff.: 92
 Anaxagoras fr. 11 D-K: 5; fr. 12: 4
Anth. Pal. vii 681-8: 91 ff. xvi 317: 92
 Appian *Mac.* iv: 9
 Archilochus fr. 2 Diehl, 1 ff.; frr. 5, 5a 6-9,
 11, 12: 3; fr. 120: 4
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 740-5: 94
 Aristotle *GA* 78^a: 8. *HA* ix 32 619^a: 187.
Pr. 903^a-38 ff., 906^a-18 ff.: 7
 Arnobius *Adv. Nat.* iv: 31: 97
 Athenaeus i 30 f.: 2
 Augustine *Civ. Dei* xviii 53: 94
 Ausonius *Prof. Burd.* 4 2: 187
 Basil *Ep.* 2 5 Ben. (*P.G.* xxxii col. 230): 8
 Bodleian Ms. Barocci 131 fol. 224: 192

- Callimachus *Hymn* vi 87-90: 102 f.
 Catullus xxxvii 2: 104
 Cicero *Agr.* ii 95: 191. *Att.* i 14 7: 99; i 16
 8-10, iii 8 4, iii 19 3: 96; iv 2 3: 98; iv 3 2:
 97 f.; vi 6 4 x 6: 191; xi 3 3: 190; xiii
 30 2: 191. *Balb.* 7: 191. *Caecin.* 33: 191.
Cat. i 19: 95. *De Or.* ii 86, iii 147: 190.
Dom. 33: 97; 43: 103; 54: 109, 129: 97.
Fam. i 9 5: 99; i 9 17: 190; iii 8 6: 191;
 iii 11 3: 190; viii 12 3: 99; xi 20 3, xii
 22a 3, xii 23 1: 190; xiii 16 2, xv 4 11: 191;
 xv 9 3: 190. *Fin.* ii 30: 190 f. *Font.* 42: 191.
Har. Resp. 5: 191; 7: 96; 8: 97; 17: 96;
 18, 22: 97; 22-26: 99; 26, 29: 97; 31: 98;
 34, 37: 97. *Imp. Pomp.* 6: 190; 94: 191.
Marcell. 33: 96. *Mil.* 104: 191. *Mur.* 54:
 190. *Nat. D.* iii 5: 97. *Part. Or.* 103: 190.
Phil. ii 103: 103; iii 21, xiii 24, xiv 11: 191.
Pis. 8-9: 96. *Plane.* 8: 191; 78: 190. *Or. iii*

- 37: 190. *QF* i 3 5: 96; ii 3 7: 98; ii 8 2: 99; iii 1 14: 98. *Quir.* 1, 8: 95; 13, 21: 96.
Rab. Perd. 4: 190. *Scaur.* 44: 190. *Sen.* 14, 23: 95; 31: 190; 31, 32: 97; 33: 96. *Sest.* 34: 97; 41: 191. *Sex. Rosc.* 126: 103. *Sull.* 23: 191. *Tusc.* i 3, 109, iv 3: 6. *Vat.* 30: 103.
Verr. ii 28: 95; iii 60: 190; iii 118, 198: 103.
Claudian de rapt. Prost. ii 163–9: 8. *in Eutrop.* i 312: 94.
Cod. Theod. vii 16 4, xvi 10 9: 94.
Curtius iv 4 17: 95.
Demosthenes xxxvii 52: 8.
Dionysius Halicarnass. *AR* iv 14: 97.
Ephraim iii 241 E: 103.
Euripides El. 321: 2. *Hel.* 375–80: 194.
Festus p. 250: 98.
Gregory of Corinth ap. Rh. Gr. vii 1236 14: 192.
Gregory of Cyprus ap. Corpus Paroem. ii p. 53: 187.
Herodian ii 437: 102.
Herodotus vi 72: 102; vii 206, viii 12 1, 26, 72: 185.
Homer Il. i 486: 3; xxii 22, 162: 192. *Od.* ix 195–211: 2; xi 602, 603, 607, 608: 103; xix 384: 3.
Horace AP 372–3, 387, 438 ff., 450, 474: 104. C. i 6 18, 35 39–40, ii 9 13, 18 38 ff., iii 5 45–46, 24 15, iv 4 29 ff.: 6; iv 15 12 ff.; 7; iv 15 25 ff.: 6 f. *Ep.* i 9 5: 6; i 19 42, ii 1 223: 104. S. i 4 23, 71, 73 ff.: 104; ii 6 109: 6.
Juvenal i 14: 104; iii 239 ff.: 100; iii 254 f.: 99 f.; iv 20 f.: 100; ix 108, xii 10–15, xiii 82: 189.
Lactantius Inst. iii 20 2: 97.
Libanius Ep. 892, 1042, 1149, 1524: 91.
Livy ix 40 16: 191; xxxxi 29 4, 40 7–41 1, 43 4–7, 46 1–5: 9; xliv 22 12: 191.
Lucian D. Mort. 5 2, 16 1, 5: 103.
Lucretius vi 1203: 189.
Lysias xvi 19: 7.
Martial i 117 10–12, vii 61 5: 104.
Menander Epit. 223, *Mis.* 41: 187. *frr.* 9, 10, 37, 45, 127, 167: 188; *frr.* 332 8, 447, 460, 689: 187.
Menander Rhetor ap. Rh. Gr. iii 393 5: 192; 402 17: 193.
Novum Testamentum i Ep. Cor. iv 21: 2.
Ovid F. iii 531–4: 188. *M.* viii 710: 191. *Ox. Pap.* xxiii 2369: 194.
Palladius Hist. Laus. xliii 46: 94.
Parmenides fr. 6 D–K: 193.
Pausanias v 9 3: 185.
Philemon 5 K: 8.
Pindar O. ix 1–2: 4. *Schol. ad O.* iii 33, 35: 185.
Plato Chrm. 159 b: 8. *Ly.* 211 a: 7. *Phd.* 84 c: 7. *Rp.* 449 b: 8.
Pliny NH x 14: 187.
Polybius xiii 1–2, xv 24 a, xvi 24 3: 9.
Quintilian vi prooem. 5: 6.
Rhet. Her. i 3: 191.
Rufinus ii 3, 32: 94.
Sallust Hist. fr. inc. 9 M: 95.
Sappho frt. 58 25, 105, 115, 156 L–P: 192; fr. 201: 103.
Scol. Att. 10 1: 2.
Seneca Ep. 65 3: 190. *Oed.* 240: 6.
Servius ad Aen. ii 287: 96; *ad Aen.* xi 143: 6.
Simplicius in Ph. p. 27: 5; p. 157: 4; p. 165 13: 5.
Sophocles OT 227–32, 1006: 7.
Sozomen vii 22: 94.
Status Silv. iv 1 37–38: 8. *Theb.* ii 15: 6; xi 284: 189.
Synesius de Somn. 11: 91. *Ep.* 129 (P.G. lxvi 1512^a–13^b): 2.
Syrianus ad Hermog. *Id.* i p. 15 Rabe: 193.
Tacitus A. i 6 6: 195; i 32: 9; i 39 4, iii 67 3, xv 17 5, 38 1, 44 3–8: 195. *H.* ii 82: 9; iii 25 1: 195.
Terence Ad. 803–4, *And.* 483, 693, 805, *Eun.* 426, 688–9, *Heaut.* 64: 188. *Heaut.* 518 ff.: 186 ff.
Theophrastus Char. 4: 8.
Thucydides vi 56 2: 2.
Valerius Maximus i 1: 97; vi 3 8: 96.
Varro LL v 112: 98. *RR* iii 2 5: 99.
Velleius Paterculus ii 48 1: 190 f.
Virgil A. xi 350: 96. *G.* ii 464: 9.
Xenophon Cyr. iv 2 39: 103. *Mem.* ii 1 2: 103; iii 9 2: 2.
Zenobius ap. Corpus Paroem. i p. 42: 187.

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>ἀβρός, 192
 ἀετοί γύρας, 187 f.
 ἀλοφόρος ἵππος, 192
 ἀποθανώ (Fut.), 103
 ἀστικτον, 188
 γαλεώτης, 188
 ἐκ προκοπῆς, 93
 ἐν 'equipped with', 2
 ἐν δορὶ, 1 ff.</p> | <p>ἐν ταῖς τρισάν, 188
 ἐπαρθέτις, 93
 θράνος, 194
 κεκλιμένος, 1
 λέωνα, 194 f.
 λύκου πτερά, 188
 μετὰ μοίραν, 93
 μικρὸν λέγειν, διαλέγεσθαι, 7
 σύμοις 'homogeneous', 4 f.</p> | <p>σύνος λύπας, 187
 παττάλου γυμνότερος, 188
 πιφασκειν, 102
 σκέλλειν, 103
 τέκτονε δούρων, 3
 χειρίς, 102
 φῶν νεόττιον, 188</p> |
|--|--|---|

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

- E. J. KENNEY, 222 ; *The Latin Love Elegy* (Luck), E. J. KENNEY, 224 ; *Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Civili* (Kraner, Hofmann, Meusel), J. H. SIMON, 226 ; *Cicéron, Traité des Lois* (de Plinval), R. G. M. NISBET, 228 ; *Livy*, vol. xiv (Schlesinger), A. H. McDONALD, 229 ; *Tacite, Histoires*, i (Wuilleumier), R. H. MARTIN, 230 ; *Tacitus, Annals*, i (Miller), R. H. MARTIN, 232 ; *Tacitus, Germania* (Fehrle, Hünnertkopf), R. H. MARTIN, 234 ; *Late Latin* (Löistedt), R. BROWNING, 235 ; *On Translation* (Browne), T. F. HIGHAM, 237 ; *Studies in the Greek Negatives* (Moorhouse), *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek* (Koppers), K. J. DOVER, 241 ; *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets* (Porzig), A. J. BEATTIE, 243 ; *Lydiaka* (Heubeck), D. M. JONES, 245 ; *From the Gracchi to Nero* (Scullard), A. H. McDONALD, 247 ; *Hellenistic Science* (Sarton), *A Source Book in Greek Science* (Cohen and Drabkin), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 250 ; *Some School Books*, B. H. KEMBALL-COOK, 252.

Short Reviews	253
Summaries of Periodicals	270
Notes and News	273
Books Received	273
Indexes	278

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melluish, Bede School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

The Lyric Age of Greece

ANDREW ROBERT BURN

This book is an account of the Greek world in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., the Greece that had emerged from the Minoan and Homeric ages, to undergo during these two centuries a revolutionary period of expansion and transformation which was to enable it in the fifth century to withstand the Persian menace and to flower into the 'classical' age of Greek civilization.

42s. net

EDWARD ARNOLD (PUBLISHERS) LTD.

OXFORD MONOGRAPHS ON CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

The Etruscan Lion

W. LLEWELLYN BROWN

In this study of the lion and its importance as a favourite subject in Etruscan art from the seventh to the third century B.C., the author also deals with the nature and sources of the 'orientalizing' influence in Etruria, and many problems of Etruscan and Greek art in the seventh century are illuminated.

Illustrated 84s. net

OXFORD CLASSICAL TEXTS

Menander: Dyscolus

Edited by H. LLOYD-JONES

Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford

This is a completely new text, which makes use of the published facsimiles of the *editio princeps* which appeared in 1959 and takes full advantage of the proposals and comments of other scholars.

15s. net

An English translation has been published under the title of *The Bad-Tempered Man or The Misanthrope*, the translator being Philip Vellacott; there is a Foreword by Christopher Fry.

10s. 6d. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

